arXiv:1203.4027v2 [math.AP] 12 Apr 2012

INVARIANT MEASURES AND THE SOLITON RESOLUTION CONJECTURE

SOURAV CHATTERJEE

Abstract. The soliton resolution conjecture for the focusing nonlinear Schrödinger equation (NLS) is the vaguely worded claim that a global solution of the NLS, for generic initial data, will eventually resolve into a radiation component that disperses like a linear solution, plus a localized component that behaves like a soliton or multi-soliton solution. Considered to be one of the fundamental open problems in the area of nonlinear dispersive equations, this conjecture has eluded a proof or even a precise formulation till date.

This paper proves a "statistical version" of this conjecture at mass-subcritical nonlinearity, in the following sense. The uniform probability distribution on the set of all functions with a given mass and energy, if such a thing existed, would be a natural invariant measure for the NLS flow and would reflect the long-term behavior for "generic initial data" with that mass and energy. Unfortunately, such a probability measure does not exist. We circumvent this problem by constructing a sequence of discrete measures that, in principle, approximate this fictitious probability distribution as the grid size goes to zero. We then show that a continuum limit of this sequence of probability measures does exist in a certain sense, and in agreement with the soliton resolution conjecture, the limit measure concentrates on the unique ground state soliton. This is proved by first proving a similar result for the discrete NLS.

The above result, following in the footsteps of a program of studying the long-term behavior of nonlinear dispersive equations through their natural invariant measures initiated by Lebowitz, Rose and Speer, and carried forward by Bourgain, McKean, Tzvetkov, Oh and others, is proved using a combination of techniques from large deviations, PDE, harmonic analysis and bare hands probability theory. It is valid in any dimension.

Contents

1. Introduction 2
2. The main result 7
3. The soliton resolution conjecture for the discrete NLS 10
4. Main ideas in the proof 14
5. Summary of notation 15

Key words and phrases. Nonlinear Schrödinger Equation, Invariant Measure, Soliton, Large Deviations.

Research partially supported by NSF grant DMS-1005312.

6. Comparison with a Gaussian function 18
7. Diagonalizing the Laplacian 18
8. The set of possible energies for a given mass 20
9. Large deviations for the gradient 24
10. The variational problem 37
11. Upper bound 38
12. Exponential decay of solitons 49
13. Lower bound 52
14. The radiating case 57
15. Discrete concentration-compactness 59
16. Harmonic analysis on the lattice 64
17. Regularity of discrete solitons 80
18. Continuum limit of discrete solitons 84
19. Continuum limit of the variational problem 89
20. Proofs of Theorems 2, 3 and 4 91
21. Proof of Theorem 5 91
22. Proof of Theorem 1 94
References 96

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. **Probabilistic motivation.**

Suppose that we are asked to choose a function $f : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{C}$ uniformly at random from the set of all $v : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{C}$ satisfying $M(v) = m$ for some given constant m, where

$$M(v) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |v(x)|^2 dx. \tag{1}$$

While this question does not make sense mathematically, the only reasonable answer that one can give is that f must be equal to zero almost everywhere. Paradoxically, this f does not satisfy $M(f) = m$. The paradox is resolved if we view this question as the limit of a sequence of discrete questions: First approximate $\mathbb{R}^d$ by a large box $[-L, L]^d$; then discretize this box by splitting it as a union of many small cubes; finally, choose a function $f : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{C}$ uniformly from the set of all functions v that are piecewise constant in these small cubes and zero outside the box $[-L, L]^d$, and satisfy $M(v) = m$. This is a probabilistically sensible question; the resulting f approaches zero in the L^∞ norm as the box size goes to infinity.

Now suppose that we add one more constraint, namely, that f should satisfy $H(f) = E$, where H is the functional

$$H(v) := \frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\nabla v(x)|^2 dx - \frac{1}{p+1}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |v(x)|^{p+1} dx, \tag{2}$$

and $p > 1$ and $E \in \mathbb{R}$ are given constants. The motivation for adding this second constraint comes from the study of microcanonical invariant measures of nonlinear Schrödinger equations (more on this later). One problem that arises immediately is that if v satisfies $M(v) = m$ and $H(v) = E$, so does the function $u(x) := \alpha_0 v(x + x_0)$ for any $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\alpha_0 \in S^1$, where S^1 is the unit circle in $\mathbb{C}$. Thus, it is reasonable to first quotient the function space by the equivalence relation $\sim$, where $u \sim v$ means that u and v are related in the above manner.

When p satisfies the "subcriticality" condition $p < 1 + 4/d$, standard results from the theory of nonlinear Schrödinger equations imply that the set of functions v that minimize $H(v)$ given $M(v) = m$ form a unique equivalence class of the relation $\sim$. This equivalence class is known as the "ground state soliton" of mass m. The main result of this manuscript (Theorem 1) says that if we attempt to choose an equivalence class uniformly at random from all classes satisfying $M(v) = m$ and $H(v) = E$, by first discretizing the problem and then passing to the continuum limit, then we end up choosing this ground state soliton. As before, there is no paradox in the fact that the ground state soliton may not satisfy the constraint $H(v) = E$. While the problem is quite simple for the single constraint $M(v) = m$, the addition of the second constraint $H(v) = E$ somehow renders it unreasonably difficult; indeed, nearly the entirety of this long manuscript is devoted to the proof of Theorem 1.

The above result is a small step towards understanding uniform probability distributions on manifolds in function spaces that are defined by a finite number of constraints. These distributions arise as "microcanonical" invariant measures for Hamiltonian flows on such manifolds. The conserved quantities for the flow give the constraints defining the manifold. A preliminary attempt with a simpler problem was made in [14]. All of this, and how it connects to the behavior of nonlinear Schrödinger flows and ideas from statistical physics, will be discussed in greater detail in the remainder of this section.

1.2. **The nonlinear Schrödinger equation.**

A complex-valued function u of two variables x and t, where $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is the space variable and $t \in \mathbb{R}$ is the time variable, is said to satisfy a d-dimensional nonlinear Schrödinger equation (NLS) if

$$\mathrm{i}\partial_t u = -\Delta u + \kappa |u|^{p-1} u, \tag{3}$$

where Δ is the Laplacian operator in $\mathbb{R}^d$, $p > 1$ is the nonlinearity parameter, and κ is a parameter which is either $+1$ or -1. When $\kappa = 1$, the equation is called "defocusing", and when $\kappa = -1$ it is called "focusing".

The study of the NLS and other nonlinear dispersive equations is a large and growing area in the analysis of PDE, with numerous open questions and conjectures. For a very readable general introduction, see Tao [62]. For a more specialized account of the state of affairs in the study of NLS, see the lecture notes of Raphaël [47]. The NLS arises in many areas of the pure and applied sciences, including Bose-Einstein condensation, Langmuir waves in plasmas, nonlinear optics, and a number of other fields [21, 22, 30, 71, 4, 23, 70, 52].

The NLS is an infinite dimensional Hamiltonian flow, with Hamiltonian given by

$$H(v) = \frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\nabla v(x)|^2 dx + \frac{\kappa}{p+1}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |v(x)|^{p+1} dx.$$

(Note that in the focusing case ($\kappa = -1$), this is just the function H defined in (2).) Consequently, if u is a solution to (3), then $H(u(t,\cdot))$ is the same for all t. Since $H(v)$ is commonly called the energy of v in the context of Hamiltonian flows, the previous sentence can be restated as: "The NLS flow conserves energy". Another important conserved quantity is the mass $M(v)$, defined in (1).

A significant amount of information is known about the defocusing NLS; in particular, it is known that in many situations, solutions of the defocusing equation disperse like solutions of the linear Schrödinger equation (see [62, p. 154]). Here "dispersion" means that while $M(u(t,\cdot))$ remains conserved, for every compact set $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} \int_K |u(x,t)|^2 dx = 0.$$

In the focusing case, however, dispersion may not occur. This is demonstrated quite simply by a special class of solutions called "solitons" or "standing waves". These are solutions of the form $u(x,t) = v(x)e^{\mathrm{i}\omega t}$, where ω is a positive constant and the function v is a solution of the soliton equation

$$-\omega v = -\Delta v - |v|^{p-1} v. \tag{4}$$

Often, the function $v(x)$ is also called a soliton. Such functions are known to be smooth and exponentially rapidly decreasing (see e.g. [13, Section 8.1]), and if one makes the further assumption that v is non-negative and spherically symmetric then there is a unique solution to (4) for each $\omega > 0$ [16, 60, 3]; we refer to this v as the "ground state". There also exist radial solutions which change sign, see [2]; such solutions are called "excited states".

The focusing equation is said to have mass-subcritical nonlinearity if the nonlinearity parameter p satisfies the subcriticality condition

$$1 < p < 1 + \frac{4}{d}.$$

Mass-subcritical nonlinearity has important consequences. For instance, if $p < 1 + 4/d$, then it is easy to show that all solutions with initial data in H^1 are global and bounded in H^1 (see [47, Section 1.1]). Another important feature of this regime is that for any $m > 0$,

$$E_{\min}(m) := \inf_{v\,:\,M(v)=m} H(v) \in (-\infty, 0), \tag{5}$$

and the infimum is achieved at the ground state soliton with mass m. In fact, it is simple to prove by a scaling argument that when $p < 1 + 4/d$, the function $E_{\min}$ has the form

$$E_{\min}(m) = m^{\alpha} E_{\min}(1), \tag{6}$$

where $E_{\min}(1) \in (-\infty, 0)$ and $\alpha > 1$ is a constant that is explicitly determined by p and d (see [47, Section 1.4]). The infimum is achieved uniquely: any energy minimizing function v must be of the form

$$v(x) = Q_{\lambda(m)}(x - x_0)e^{\mathrm{i}\gamma_0},$$

where $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\gamma_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, and $Q_{\lambda(m)}$ is the unique ground state soliton with mass m. The ground state soliton $Q_{\lambda(m)}$ has the following explicit form: Let Q be the unique positive and radially symmetric solution of the equation

$$-Q = -\Delta Q - |Q|^{p-1}Q. \tag{7}$$

For each $\lambda > 0$, let

$$Q_\lambda(x) := \lambda^{2/(p-1)} Q(\lambda x). \tag{8}$$

Then for each $m > 0$, there is a unique $\lambda(m) > 0$ such that $Q_{\lambda(m)}$ is the ground state soliton of mass m. For all of the above claims about ground state solitons in the mass-subcritical regime, see [47, Sections 1.2 and 1.3]. The uniqueness of the ground state is a particularly deep result. See also [62, Appendix B].

When $p \geq 1 + 4/d$, much less is known; it is currently an area of active research (see [26, 28] for recent developments and pointers to the literature).

Even in the mass-subcritical case, little is known about the long-term behavior of solutions. One particularly important conjecture, sometimes called the "soliton resolution conjecture" (see Tao [62, p. 154]), claims (vaguely) that as $t \to \infty$, the solution $u(\cdot, t)$ would look more and more like a soliton, or a union of a finite number of receding solitons. The claim may not hold for all initial conditions, but is expected to hold for "most" (i.e. generic) initial data. In the critical and supercritical regimes, the conjecture is still supposed to be true, but with the additional imposition that the solution does not blow up. The conjecture is based mainly on numerical simulations, although there has been a limited amount of progress towards a proof (see [40, 56, 61, 63, 64] and references therein). The only case where one can give a heuristic treatment is when $d = 1$ and $p = 3$, where the NLS is completely integrable (see [55, 41, 72]). The soliton resolution conjecture has been investigated for other dispersive systems, with partial results [34, 53, 54, 19, 20]. For recent progress on the soliton resolution conjecture for the energy-critical wave equation and a far more extensive survey of the literature around the conjecture, see [18].

1.3. **Invariant measures for the NLS.** One approach to understanding the long-term behavior of global solutions is through the study of invariant Gibbs measures. Roughly, the idea is as follows. Since the NLS is a Hamiltonian flow, one might expect by Liouville's theorem that Lebesgue measure on the space of all functions of suitable regularity, if such a thing existed, would be an invariant measure for the flow (see, e.g., [1, p. 68] for a statement of Liouville's theorem in the finite dimensional setting). Since the flow preserves energy, this would imply that Gibbs measures that have density proportional to

$$\exp(-\kappa\beta H(v)) \tag{9}$$

with respect to this fictitious Lebesgue measure (where β is arbitrary) would also be invariant for the flow. One way to make this rigorous is to first restrict the system to the unit torus $\mathbb{T}^d$ and then consider Gibbs measures that have density proportional to

$$\exp\left(\kappa\beta\int_{\mathbb{T}^d}|v(x)|^{p+1}dx\right) \tag{10}$$

with respect to the free-field Gaussian measure (see [32]) on the appropriate space of distributions on $\mathbb{T}^d$. This is the pioneering idea of Lebowitz, Rose and Speer [33]. For such a thing to make sense in $d \ge 2$, one has to interpret the integral in the Wick-ordered sense.

These Gibbs measures exist for the defocusing case ($\kappa = 1$) for all p in $d = 1$ (without Wick ordering) and for $p \le 5$ in $d = 2$, and $p \le 3$ in $d = 3$ [24]. Furthermore, despite the fact that this measure is supported on rough functions, Bourgain showed that it is invariant under the dynamics given by (3) for $d \le 2$ [6]. This means that the dynamics can be defined (after Wick ordering modification in $d = 2$) on a set of full measure with respect to this Gibbs measure.

The focusing case ($\kappa = -1$) is more delicate. Since H is unbounded from below, it is obvious that the Gibbs measure cannot exist without some restrictions on its domain. It was shown in [33] that in $d = 1$, the Gibbs measure exists for $p = 3$ when restricted to L^2 balls and that it exists for $p = 5$ with the additional condition of small β. The development was continued by Bourgain [5], McKean [35], McKean and Vaninsky in [36, 37, 38] and Zhidkov [73]. In $d = 2$, Jaffe showed that the measure exists for $p = 2$ for real u when restricted to L^2 balls and after Wick ordering (see [32]); while Brydges and Slade [9] showed that this does not work when $p = 3$.

Invariant measures coupled with Bourgain's development [5, 6, 7, 8] of the so-called $X^{s,b}$ spaces ("Bourgain spaces") for constructing global solutions has led to important developments in this field. Recently, striking advances have been made by Tzvetkov and coauthors [66, 10, 67, 11, 12, 68, 65] and Oh and coauthors [17, 42, 43, 44, 46, 45] and others (e.g. [39]) who use invariant measures and Bourgain's method to construct global solutions of the NLS and other nonlinear dispersive equations with random initial data.

Qualitative features of the infinite volume limit of Gibbs measures were studied by Brydges and Slade [9] in $d = 2$ and Rider [48, 49] in $d = 1$. Invariant Gibbs measures for the cubic discrete nonlinear Schrödinger equation (DNLS) in $d \geq 3$ were studied in [15].

Another idea that is gaining traction in the physics circles in recent years is that of considering microcanonical ensembles (see e.g. [51, 52] and references therein). The general idea – which has already been discussed at the beginning of this section – is to consider an abstract manifold of functions satisfying certain constraints (usually two) and then trying to understand the characteristics of a function picked uniformly at random from this manifold. Often, the physicists alternately characterize the uniform distribution as the "maximum entropy" distribution. For example, in the context of the NLS, one looks at the "uniform distribution" on the space of all functions with a given mass and energy. The relevance of this to the long term behavior of NLS flows is heuristically justified through Liouville's theorem; we have more on this in the next section. It is in an attempt to understand these physical heuristics that I got interested in this line of research (and I thank Persi Diaconis – who heard about it from Julien Barré – for communicating these problems to me a few years ago). In an early paper [14] that I wrote on this topic, I tried to understand the behavior of functions chosen uniformly from all functions satisfying $\int |u(x)|^2 dx = m$ and $\int |u(x)|^{p+1} dx = -E$, completely ignoring the gradient term in the Hamiltonian. Already in this simplified situation one can prove interesting phase transitions and localization phenomena. In a later paper with Kay Kirkpatrick [15], the gradient term was added to the analysis, but the nonlinearity parameter was taken to be so large that the gradient term became practically unimportant. In both [14] and [15], the settings were discrete and too crude to allow passage to a continuum limit. The purpose of the current manuscript is to undertake the more serious task of analyzing regimes where the gradient term actually matters, and a continuum limit can be taken.

2. The main result

Assume that $\kappa = -1$ for the rest of this manuscript. Given $m > 0$ and $E > E_{\min}(m)$ (where $E_{\min}(m)$ is the minimum energy for mass m, as defined in (5)), let

$$S(E, m) := \{v \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^d) : M(v) = m \text{ and } H(v) = E\} \tag{11}$$

be the set of all H^1 functions of mass m and energy E. Since the NLS flow (3) preserves mass and energy, the same heuristic via Liouville's theorem that led to (9) would imply that a "uniform distribution" on $S(E, m)$, if such a thing existed, would be an invariant measure for the flow. In physics parlance, these measures would be the "Microcanonical Ensembles" corresponding to the "Grand Canonical Ensembles" given by (9).

If the soliton resolution conjecture is indeed true, and an invariant measure like the microcanonical ensemble suggested above indeed exists and describes the long-term behavior of the typical NLS flow with a given mass and energy, then it should put all its mass on soliton or multi-soliton functions. This may seem like a contradiction since such functions may not have energy E as required for membership in $S(E,m)$. However there is no actual contradiction since $S(E,m)$ is not compact under any reasonable metric.

Our goal is to go ahead and try to give a meaning to the abstract nonsense outlined above. To give a meaning to the notion of a uniform probability distribution on the set of all functions with a given mass and energy, we restrict ourselves first to a finite region of space, and then to a discretization of it. Instead of $\mathbb{R}^d$, therefore, our space would be the discrete grid

$$V_n = \{0,1,\ldots,n-1\}^d = (\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})^d.$$

We imagine this set embedded in $\mathbb{R}^d$ as hV_n, where $h > 0$ is a parameter representing the grid size. Note that hV_n is a discrete approximation of the box $[0,nh]^d$. We would eventually want to send nh to ∞.

The mass and energy of a function $v : V_n \to \mathbb{C}$ at grid size h and box size n are defined in analogy with (1) and (2) as

$$M_{h,n}(v) := h^d \sum_{x\in V_n} |v(x)|^2, \tag{12}$$

and

$$H_{h,n}(v) := \frac{h^d}{2} \sum_{\substack{x,y\in V_n\\ x\sim y}} \left|\frac{v(x)-v(y)}{h}\right|^2 - \frac{h^d}{p+1}\sum_{x\in V_n} |v(x)|^{p+1}, \tag{13}$$

where $x \sim y$ means that x and y are neighbors in V_n. For simplicity, we endow V_n with the graph structure of a discrete torus, i.e. identifying n with 0. Let $\mathbb{C}^{V_n}$ denote the set of all functions from V_n into $\mathbb{C}$. Take any $\epsilon > 0$, $m > 0$ and $E \in \mathbb{R}$, and define the set

$$S_{\epsilon,h,n}(E,m) := \{v \in \mathbb{C}^{V_n} : |M_{h,n}(v) - m| \le \epsilon, |H_{h,n}(v) - E| \le \epsilon\}. \tag{14}$$

Clearly, $S_{\epsilon,h,n}(E,m)$ is a finite volume subset of the finite dimensional space $\mathbb{C}^{V_n}$. This set is a "manageable" version of the set $S(E,m)$ defined in (11). Indeed, as $\epsilon \to 0$, $h \to 0$ and $nh \to \infty$, the set $S_{\epsilon,h,n}(E,m)$ may be imagined as tending to the limit set $S(E,m)$.

We have chosen $\epsilon > 0$ to ensure that the volume is nonzero whenever the set is non-empty. In this situation, the uniform probability distribution on this set is well-defined. This uniform probability distribution, besides being an approximation to our abstract object of interest, has also a concrete interpretation as a natural invariant measure for an appropriate discrete NLS evolution on V_n, to be discussed in the next section.

Fix E and m such that $E > E_{\min}(m)$. Given ϵ, h and n, let $\mu_{\epsilon,h,n}$ be the uniform probability distribution on $S_{\epsilon,h,n}(E,m)$. Let $f_{\epsilon,h,n}$ be a random function on V_n with law $\mu_{\epsilon,h,n}$. Our main result, stated below, is that when the nonlinearity is mass-subcritical, the random function $f_{\epsilon,h,n}$ converges in a certain sense to the unique ground state soliton $Q_{\lambda(m)}$ of mass m defined in Section 1, as (ϵ, h, nh) goes to $(0, 0, \infty)$ in a certain manner.

To define the notion of convergence, we first need a way of comparing functions on V_n with functions on $\mathbb{Z}^d$ and $\mathbb{R}^d$. Given $v : V_n \to \mathbb{C}$, first define its extension v^e to $\mathbb{Z}^d$ by simply defining v^e as equal to v on V_n and zero outside. Next, given a function $w : \mathbb{Z}^d \to \mathbb{C}$, define its "continuum image at grid size h" as the function $\tilde{w} : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{C}$, defined as follows. Given $y = (y_1, \ldots, y_d) \in \mathbb{R}^d$, let $x = (x_1, \ldots, x_d)$ be the unique point in $\mathbb{Z}^d$ such that for each i,

$$x_i \le y_i/h < x_i + 1,$$

and let $\tilde{w}(y) := w(x)$. (In other words, $x_i = [y_i/h]$.) Lastly, given $v : V_n \to \mathbb{C}$, define its continuum image $\tilde{v} : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{C}$ at grid size h as the function $\tilde{v}^e$, that is, the continuum image of the extended function v^e.

For each $q \in [1, \infty]$ define a pseudometric $\tilde{L}^q$ on the set of measurable complex-valued functions on $\mathbb{R}^d$ as

$$\tilde{L}^q(u, v) := \inf_{x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d,\, \alpha_0 \in S^1} \|u(\cdot) - \alpha_0 v(\cdot + x_0)\|_q, \tag{15}$$

where S^1 is the unit circle in the complex plane and $\|\cdot\|_q$ denotes the usual L^q norm of a complex-valued function on $\mathbb{R}^d$ with respect to Lebesgue measure. This is a pseudometric since $\tilde{L}^q(u, v)$ may be zero even if u and v are not equal, but v is of the form $v(x) = \alpha_0 u(x + x_0)$ for some $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\alpha_0 \in S^1$. It is necessary to work with pseudometrics since the law of $f_{\epsilon,h,n}$ is invariant under translations and multiplication by scalars of unit modulus.

Theorem 1. *Suppose that* $1 < p < 1 + 4/d$. *Fix* E *and* m *such that* $E > E_{\min}(m)$, *where* $E_{\min}$ *is defined in* (5). *Let* $f_{\epsilon,h,n}$ *be a uniform random choice from the set* $S_{\epsilon,h,n}(E, m)$ *defined in* (14), *and let* $\tilde{f}_{\epsilon,h,n}$ *denote its continuum image at grid size* h, *as defined above. Let* $\tilde{L}^q$ *be the pseudometric defined above. Then for any* $\delta > 0$ *and any* $q \in (2, \infty]$,

$$\lim_{h \to 0} \limsup_{\epsilon \to 0} \limsup_{n \to \infty} \mathbb{P}(\tilde{L}^q(\tilde{f}_{\epsilon,h,n}, Q_{\lambda(m)}) > \delta) = 0,$$

where $Q_{\lambda(m)}$ *is the unique ground soliton of mass* m *defined in Section* 1. *Moreover, there is a sequence* (ϵ_k, h_k, n_k) *with* $\epsilon_k \to 0$, $h_k \to 0$ *and* $n_k h_k \to \infty$ *as* $k \to \infty$, *such that for any fixed* $\delta > 0$ *and* $q \in (2, \infty]$,

$$\lim_{k \to \infty} \mathbb{P}(\tilde{L}^q(\tilde{f}_{\epsilon_k,h_k,n_k}, Q_{\lambda(m)}) > \delta) = 0.$$

Note that the energy of $f_{\epsilon,h,n}$ is converging to E, whereas the energy of $Q_{\lambda(m)}$ is $E_{\min}(m)$, which is strictly less than E. There is no contradiction here, since the metrics of convergence are not strong enough to ensure convergence of the Hamiltonian. Nor should they be, actually, since the difference $E - E_{\min}(m)$ denotes the amount of energy that has "escaped" to infinity when the NLS has flowed for a long (infinite) time.

Let me emphasize here that Theorem 1 *does not* say that a certain Gibbs measure concentrates on its lowest energy state in the infinite volume limit.

In fact, the soliton $Q_{\lambda(m)}$ is not in the support of the measure $\mu_{\epsilon,h,n}$ at all, even in the limit. What Theorem 1 says is much more subtle: In the infinite volume continuum limit, a typical function with mass m and energy E decomposes into an "invisible" or "radiating" part that is small in L^∞ norm but contains a significant amount of energy due to microscopic fluctuations, and a "visible part" that is close to the soliton $Q_{\lambda(m)}$ in the L^∞ distance.

It may seem strange that while a certain amount of energy escapes to infinity, there is no escape of mass. Again there is no contradiction, since functions of arbitrarily small L^2 mass on $\mathbb{R}^d$ can hold arbitrarily large amounts of energy by being very wiggly.

Lastly, one may question the implications of Theorem 1 for the dynamics of the NLS. Indeed, a probability measure that concentrates on the time oscillates of a single soliton is also an invariant measure for the NLS and carries no special information. The difference between such a special invariant measure and the Microcanonical Ensemble is that support of the Microcanonical Ensemble contains almost every function of mass m and energy E. In other words, almost every ergodic component of functions with mass m and energy E has the property that for initial data in that ergodic component, the flow converges to the soliton $Q_{\lambda(m)}$ as time tends to infinity.

Of course, none of this makes rigorous sense since we are in a highly non-compact setting. In fact, it is clear that Theorem 1 does not model the full dynamics of NLS from the following observation: There are stable multisoliton solutions consisting of two or more receding solitons which do not generally collapse into a single ground state. This is possibly because the effect of recession "outruns" the thermodynamic convergence to equilibrium.

Nevertheless, the argument leading to Theorem 1 does give a proof of a statistical version of the conjecture in the discrete setting when we take ϵ very close to 0 and n very large, but keep h fixed. In this situation there is enough compactness to ensure that receding solitons cannot outrun the convergence to equilibrium. This is the topic of the next section.

3. THE SOLITON RESOLUTION CONJECTURE FOR THE DISCRETE NLS

Equation (3) can be discretized to give the so-called 'discrete nonlinear Schrödinger equation' (DNLS). For the DNLS, only space (and not time) is discretized: we substitute $\mathbb{R}^d$ by the discrete grid $h\mathbb{Z}^d$, where h is the lattice spacing. The limit $h \to 0$ is called the 'continuum limit' in the literature on the DNLS.

The discrete nearest-neighbor Laplacian on $\mathbb{Z}^d$ with grid size h is defined as

$$\Delta v(x) := \frac{1}{h^2} \sum_{y\,:\,y\sim x} (v(y) - v(x)), \tag{16}$$

where $y \sim x$ denotes the sum over all neighbors of x and v is any complex-valued function on $\mathbb{Z}^d$. Note that the scaling by h^2 is meant to ensure that if v is the restriction of some smooth function $\tilde{v}$ on the grid $h\mathbb{Z}^d$ (i.e.

$v(x) = \tilde{v}(hx)$), then the discrete Laplacian converges to $\Delta\tilde{v}$ as the grid size goes to zero.

In analogy with equation (3), the discrete focusing NLS on $h\mathbb{Z}^d$ with nonlinearity parameter p is a family of coupled ODEs

$$\mathrm{i}\frac{du}{dt} = -\Delta u - |u|^{p-1}u, \tag{17}$$

where Δ is the discrete Laplacian for grid size h defined in (16) and $u(x,t)$ is a function on $\mathbb{Z}^d \times \mathbb{R}$. The mass $M_h(v)$ and the energy $H_h(v)$ of a function $v : \mathbb{Z}^d \to \mathbb{C}$ at grid size h may be defined just as in (12) and (13), but after replacing V_n by $\mathbb{Z}^d$. As in the continuous case, the DNLS is a Hamiltonian system and the mass and energy are conserved under the DNLS flow.

The DNLS has been studied widely by physicists, but not so much by mathematicians, particularly in dimensions higher than 1. For a recent survey of the mix of rigorous and non-rigorous results that exist in the literature, see [27]. We will now outline some of the results about the DNLS that are proved in this manuscript en route to the proof of Theorem 1.

Given $h > 0$ and $m \geq 0$, let $E_{\max}(m,h)$ and $E_{\min}(m,h)$ denote the supremum and infimum of possible energies of functions with mass m at grid size h.

Theorem 2. *Suppose that* $1 < p < 1 + 4/d$. *With the above definitions, for any* $h > 0$ *and* $m > 0$ *we have* $E_{\max}(m,h) = 2dm/h^2$ *and* $-\infty < E_{\min}(m,h) < 0$. *Moreover, the function* $E_{\min}$ *satisfies for all positive* m *and* m' *the strict subadditive inequality* $E_{\min}(m+m',h) < E_{\min}(m,h) + E_{\min}(m',h)$. *Lastly,* $\lim_{h\to 0} E_{\min}(m,h) = E_{\min}(m)$ *and the convergence is uniform over compact subsets of* $(0,\infty)$.

The first couple of assertions of Theorem 2 are proved in Section 8. The subadditive inequality is proved in Section 15. The convergence argument is more complicated. It follows from Corollary 69 in Section 18. The convergence is based on the convergence of discrete solitons to continuum solitons (see Theorem 4 below). These scattered results are gathered into a formal proof of Theorem 2 in Section 20.

As in Section 2, we define a set of pseudometrics on the space of all complex-valued functions on $\mathbb{Z}^d$. For any $q \in [1,\infty]$, let $\tilde{L}^q$ be the pseudometric on $\mathbb{C}^{\mathbb{Z}^d}$ defined as

$$\tilde{L}^q(u,v) := \inf_{x_0\in\mathbb{Z}^d,\, \alpha_0\in S^1} \|u(\cdot) - \alpha_0 v(\cdot + x_0)\|_q, \tag{18}$$

where $\|\cdot\|_q$ is the usual L^q norm on $\mathbb{C}^{\mathbb{Z}^d}$.

Let $\mathcal{S}(m,h)$ be the set of all functions f with $M_h(f) = m$ and $H_h(f) = E_{\min}(m,h)$. The set $\mathcal{S}(m,h)$ will be called the set of discrete ground state solitons with mass m at grid size h. Note that, as in the continuum case, a simple Euler-Lagrange argument shows that any discrete ground state soliton must necessarily satisfy the discrete soliton equation

$$-\omega v = -\Delta v - |v|^{p-1}v$$

for some $\omega > 0$.

Unlike the continuum case, the discrete ground state soliton for a given mass may not be unique. However, we do know from the following theorem that $\mathcal{S}(m,h)$ is non-empty and compact in the $\tilde{L}^q$-topologies. Not only that, the set $\mathcal{S}(m,h)$ also has an analog of the so-called "orbital stability" property (see [47, Section 1.3]) of continuum solitons: any function that has near-minimal energy must be nearly a soliton. The subadditive inequality from Theorem 2, together with the classical concentration-compactness technique [47, Section 1.4], is the key to the proof of this result. (Note that the subadditive inequality is trivial in the continuous case by the formula (6).)

Theorem 3. *Suppose that* $1 < p < 1 + 4/d$*. Let* $\mathcal{S}(m,h)$ *be the set of ground state solitons of mass* m *at grid size* h*, as defined above. Then for any* $m > 0$ *and* $h > 0$*,* $\mathcal{S}(m,h)$ *is non-empty. Moreover, for any sequence of functions* f_k *such that* $M_h(f_k) \to m$ *and* $H_h(f_k) \to E_{\min}(m,h)$*, there is a sub-sequence* f_{k_j} *and some* $f \in \mathcal{S}(m,h)$ *such that* f_{k_j} *converges to* f *in the* $\tilde{L}^q$ *pseudometric for any* $q \in [2,\infty]$*.*

The main argument for the proof of Theorem 3, using a discretization of the concentration-compactness method, is presented in Section 15. The proof is completed in Section 20.

What happens to $\mathcal{S}(m,h)$ as h tends to zero? The next theorem answers this question. As $h \to 0$, the $\mathcal{S}(m,h)$ shrinks to a single point, namely, the unique continuum ground state soliton $Q_{\lambda(m)}$ defined in Section 1. For related results on continuum limits of the discrete NLS in one dimension, see [29].

Theorem 4. *Suppose that* $1 < p < 1 + 4/d$*. Let* m_k *be a positive sequence converging to some* $m > 0$*. Let* h_k *be a positive sequence tending to zero. For each* k*, let* f_k *be an element of* $\mathcal{S}(m_k,h_k)$*. Let* $\tilde{f}_k$ *be the continuum image of* f_k *at grid size* h*, as defined in Section* 2*. Let* $\tilde{L}^q$ *be the pseudometric on* $L^q(\mathbb{R}^d)$ *defined in Section* 2*. Then for any* $q \in [2,\infty]$*,* $\lim_{k\to\infty} \tilde{L}^q(\tilde{f}_k, Q_{\lambda(m)}) = 0$*.*

The above theorem is proved by showing that for small h, discrete ground state solitons can be approximated by smooth functions – and then applying the orbital stability of continuum solitons [47, Section 1.3]. To show that discrete ground state solitons can be approximated by smooth functions, one has to prove regularity estimates that do not blow up as $h \to 0$. To achieve this, the route taken in this paper is to translate the proof of regularity of continuum solitons (as sketched in [62, Proposition B.7]) to the discrete setting and obtain "h-free" estimates. This translation necessitates the development of a slew of discrete harmonic analytic results, including fine properties of discrete Green's functions, discrete Littlewood-Paley decompositions, and a discrete Hardy-Littlewood-Sobolev inequality of fractional integration. The harmonic analytic tools are developed in Section 16, and the regularity of discrete solitons is worked out in Section 17. The convergence argument is presented in Section 18.

Next, recall the random function $f_{\epsilon,h,n}$ from Section 2. Observe that by Liouville's theorem, the law of $f_{\epsilon,h,n}$ is an invariant measure for the DNLS flow (17) at grid size h. In Theorem 1, we saw what happens to $f_{\epsilon,h,n}$ as $(\epsilon, h, nh) \to (0, 0, \infty)$ in a certain manner. On the way to proving Theorem 1, we first investigate what happens to $f_{\epsilon,h,n}$ as $(\epsilon, n) \to (0, \infty)$, fixing $h > 0$. What happens is the following: with high probability, $f_{\epsilon,h,n}$ is close to a discrete ground state soliton of mass m', where $m' \in [0, m]$ is determined in a complicated manner by E, m and h. The following theorem makes this precise.

Theorem 5. *Suppose that* $1 < p < 1+4/d$. *Take any* $E \in \mathbb{R}$, $m > 0$ *and* $h > 0$ *such that* $E_{\min}(m, h) < E < E_{\max}(m, h)$. *Let* $f_{\epsilon,h,n}$ *be a uniform random choice from the set* $S_{\epsilon,h,n}(E, m)$ *defined in* (14), *and extend its domain to* $\mathbb{Z}^d$ *by defining it to be zero outside* V_n. *If* $E < \frac{1}{2}E_{\max}(m, h)$, *then there exists a compact set* $K \subseteq [0, m]$ *such that for any* $\delta > 0$ *and any* $q \in (2, \infty]$,

$$\lim_{\epsilon\to 0}\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{P}\biggl(\inf_{m'\in K}\inf_{v\in\mathcal{S}(m',h)} \tilde{L}^q(f_{\epsilon,h,n},\, v) > \delta\biggr) = 0.$$

Furthermore, the set K *can be described as follows. It is the set of all* $m' \in [0, m]$ *that maximize*

$$\log(m - m') - \Psi_d\biggl(\frac{2h^2(E - E_{\min}(m', h))}{m - m'}\biggr),$$

where $\Psi_d : \mathbb{R} \to [0, \infty]$ *is the function*

$$\Psi_d(\alpha) = \sup_{0<\gamma<1} \int_{[0,1]^d} \log\biggl(1 - \gamma + \frac{4\gamma}{\alpha}\sum_{i=1}^d \sin^2(\pi x_i)\biggr) dx_1 \cdots dx_d \tag{19}$$

for $\alpha \in (0, 2d)$, $\Psi_d(\alpha) = \Psi_d(4d - \alpha)$ *for* $\alpha \in (2d, 4d)$, $\Psi_d(2d) = 0$, *and* $\Psi_d(\alpha) = \infty$ *for* $\alpha \geq 4d$ *and* $\alpha \leq 0$. *Lastly, if* $E \geq \frac{1}{2}E_{\max}(m, h)$, *then for any* $\delta > 0$,

$$\lim_{\epsilon\to 0}\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{P}(\|f_{\epsilon,h,n}\|_\infty > \delta) = 0.$$

In a few words, the above theorem says the following: "For the DNLS on a large torus, a typical function with a given mass and energy is close in the L^∞ distance to a soliton with a (possibly) different mass and energy."

Theorem 5 proves the following statistical version of the soliton resolution conjecture for the DNLS restricted to a large torus. The uniform distribution $\mu_{\epsilon,h,n}$ on the set $S_{\epsilon,h,n}(E, m)$ is an invariant measure for the DNLS flow on the torus V_n but is not ergodic. Elementary ergodic theory tells us that it decomposes as a convex combination of ergodic components (see e.g. [69, Section 6.2]). The ergodic decomposition of $\mu_{\epsilon,h,n}$ yields a natural probability measure $\tau_{\epsilon,h,n}$ on the space of ergodic measures on $S_{\epsilon,h,n}(E, m)$ for the DNLS flow (that chooses ergodic components with "probability proportional to size").

The long-term behavior of the flow is dictated by the ergodic component to which the initial data belongs. Theorem 5 implies that if $\tau_{\epsilon,h,n}$ is the relevant probability measure on the space of ergodic components, then for the vast majority of components, the long-term behavior indeed matches the prediction of the soliton resolution conjecture: some amount mass and energy flow out "to infinity" in the form of a function of small L^∞ norm, and whatever remains is close to a soliton.

The proof of Theorem 5 is divided into several components. The first ingredient, proved in Section 9, is a large deviation principle for gradients of random functions. The variational problem related to this large deviation principle is dealt with in Section 10. The proof of the main identity in Theorem 5 is separated into two pieces: first an upper bound, and then a matching lower bound. The upper bound in the case $E < \frac{1}{2}E_{\max}(m,h)$ is proved in Section 11. The matching lower bound requires us to first prove the exponential decay of discrete solitons. This is done in Section 12, mostly along the lines of the proof of exponential decay of continuum solitons [62, Proposition B.7], but with the crucial difference that we now have to deal with discrete Green's functions. Using the information from Section 12, the lower bound is proved in Section 13. Finally, the case $E \geq \frac{1}{2}E_{\max}(m,h)$ is handled in Section 14. Everything is formally put together to complete the proof of Theorem 5 in Section 21.

Last of all, let us indicate how all this leads to the proof of Theorem 1. This is quite easy, given Theorems 5 and 4. We just take the limit $h \to 0$ in the explicit formula given in Theorem 5. The main step is to prove that the set K in Theorem 5 shrinks to the singleton set $\{0\}$ as h goes to 0. This is done in Section 19. The convergence of discrete solitons to continuum solitons as given by Theorem 4 finishes the proof. This argument is formalized in Section 22.

4. Main ideas in the proof

Let $f : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{C}$ be a function "uniformly chosen" from the set of functions satisfying $M(f) = m$ and $H(f) = E$, whatever that means. We need to show that for any set A of functions that do not contain the ground state soliton, the chance of $f \in A$ is zero.

Take any $\delta > 0$ and let $V_\delta := \{x : |f(x)| \leq \delta\}$. Then

$$\int_{V_\delta} |f(x)|^{p+1} dx \leq \delta^{p-1} \int_{V_\delta} |f(x)|^2 dx \leq \delta^{p-1} m.$$

Decompose f as $u + v$, where $u = f1_{V_\delta}$ and $v = f1_{\mathbb{R}^d \setminus V_\delta}$. The above inequality shows that when δ is close to zero,

$$H(u) \approx \frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\nabla u(x)|^2 dx.$$

On the other hand

$$\mathrm{Vol}(\mathbb{R}^d \backslash V_\delta) \le \frac{1}{\delta^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \backslash V_\delta} |f(x)|^2 dx \le \frac{m}{\delta^2}.$$

Let us refer to v and u as the "visible" and "invisible" parts of f. The last two inequalities show that:

- The visible part is supported on a finite volume set, whose size is controlled by δ.
- The energy of the invisible part is essentially the same as the L^2 norm squared of its gradient, times 1/2.

The game now is to compute $\mathbb{P}(f \in A)$ by controlling the visible and invisible parts separately. The visible part, being supported on a "small" set, can be analyzed directly. For the invisible part, one has to develop joint large deviations for the mass and the gradient, since the nonlinear term is negligible in the invisible part. Solving the variational problem related to the large deviation question, one arrives at the conclusion that the visible part must be close to the ground state soliton with high probability.

The main steps in the above program are the following.

1. Develop large deviation estimates for the invisible part in the finite volume discrete case. This is done in Sections 6, 7, 9, 11, 12, 13 and 14.
2. Analyze the variational problem related to this large deviation question, and thereby show that with high probability, the visible part has the minimum possible energy for its mass. This is done in Sections 8, 10 and 19.
3. Pass to the infinite volume limit (keeping the grid size fixed) using a discretization of the classical concentration-compactness argument, and show convergence to discrete solitons. This is done in Sections 15 and 20.
4. Develop discrete analogs of harmonic analytic tools (Littlewood-Paley decompositions, Hardy-Littlewood-Sobolev inequality of fractional integration, Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality, discrete Green's function estimates, etc.) to prove smoothness estimates for discrete solitons that do not blow up as the grid size → 0. This is done in Sections 16 and 17.
5. Use these smoothness estimates, together with the orbital stability of the ground state soliton, to prove convergence of discrete solitons to continuum solitons. This is done in Section 18.

5. SUMMARY OF NOTATION

In this section we summarize the notation that will be used repeatedly in this manuscript. Some of it has already been introduced, and some will be defined in later sections. The summary in this section is for the reader's convenience.

5.1. **Spaces and norms.** For a typical element $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we denote the ith coordinate of x by x_i. The usual Euclidean norm of a vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is denoted by $|x|$, while the ℓ^1 norm of x is denoted by $|x|_1$. The same notation is used for norms of vectors in $\mathbb{Z}^d$.

The L^q norms for functions on $\mathbb{R}^d$ and $\mathbb{Z}^d$ are defined as usual, and they induce the pseudometrics $\tilde{L}^q$ defined in (15) and (18). The L^q norm of a function v, whether on $\mathbb{R}^d$ or on $\mathbb{Z}^d$, is denoted by $\|v\|_q$.

Sometimes, we use a slightly different L^q norm for functions on $\mathbb{Z}^d$ by combining the usual L^q norm with the grid size h to get an $L^{q,h}$-norm:

$$\|v\|_{q,h} := h^{d/q}\|v\|_q.$$

These norms will be used heavily in Sections 16 and 17.

5.2. **The discrete torus.** Assuming that the dimension d is fixed, the torus V_n in $\mathbb{Z}^d$ is the set $\{0, 1, \ldots, n-1\}^d$. We say two elements x and y in V_n are neighbors, and write $x \sim y$, if $|x - y| = 1$, where the difference $x - y$ is computed by subtraction modulo n in each coordinate.

Sometimes, we use ∂V_n to denote the boundary of the torus when considered as a subset of $\mathbb{Z}^d$ (without the toric graph structure). In general ∂U denotes the boundary of a set $U \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^d$ or $U \subseteq V_n$. That is, ∂U is the set of points in U that are adjacent to some point outside U. Note that this boundary is different if U is considered as a subset of the torus V_n rather than as a subset of $\mathbb{Z}^d$. Similarly, U^c denotes the set $\mathbb{Z}^d \setminus U$ when U is a subset of $\mathbb{Z}^d$, whereas U^c denotes $V_n \setminus U$ when U is considered as a subset of the torus V_n.

5.3. **Mass and energy.** The mass of a function $v : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{C}$ is defined as

$$M(v) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |v(x)|^2 dx,$$

and its energy, in the context of the NLS equation (3) with $\kappa = -1$, is defined as

$$H(v) = \frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |\nabla v(x)|^2 dx - \frac{1}{p+1}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |v(x)|^{p+1} dx.$$

When v is a function on $\mathbb{Z}^d$, its mass "at grid size h" is defined as

$$M_h(v) = h^d \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} |v(x)|^2.$$

Similarly, the energy at grid size h is defined as

$$H_h(v) = \frac{h^d}{2} \sum_{\substack{x,y \in \mathbb{Z}^d \\ x \sim y}} \left|\frac{v(x) - v(y)}{h}\right|^2 - \frac{h^d}{p+1} \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} |v(x)|^{p+1}. \tag{20}$$

For a function v on the torus V_n, the mass $M_{h,n}(v)$ and the energy $H_{h,n}(v)$ are defined exactly as in the last two displays, except that the sums are now over elements of V_n instead of $\mathbb{Z}^d$.

For a function $v : \mathbb{Z}^d \to \mathbb{C}$, the energy $H_h(v)$ can be decomposed into the gradient component $G_h(v)$ and the nonlinear component $N_h(v)$, defined as the first and second terms on the right-hand side in (20), so that $H_h(v) = G_h(v) - N_h(v)$. Similarly, we define $G_{h,n}(v)$ and $N_{h,n}(v)$.

Given a subset $U \subseteq V_n$, we define

$$G_{h,n}(v, U) = \frac{h^d}{2} \sum_{\substack{x,y \in U \\ x \sim y}} \left| \frac{v(x) - v(y)}{h} \right|^2,$$

and $H_{h,n}(v, U)$, $N_{h,n}(v, U)$ and $M_{h,n}(v, U)$ are defined similarly.

5.4. **Maximum and minimum energies.** Suppose that p and d are given. For each $m \geq 0$, we define $E_{\max}(m)$ and $E_{\min}(m)$ to be the supremum and infimum of the set of all possible energies for functions with a given mass on $\mathbb{R}^d$, where mass and energy are defined as above. It is not difficult to verify that $E_{\max}(m) = \infty$, and it is known that $E_{\min}(m)$ has the form (6) when $p < 1 + 4/d$.

In the discrete case on $\mathbb{Z}^d$, we define $E_{\max}(m, h)$ and $E_{\min}(m, h)$ to be supremum and infimum of the set of all possible energies for functions with mass m, where both mass and energy are computed at grid size h. We prove a number of things about these quantities in Section 8.

Finally, for functions on the torus V_n, we similarly define $E_{\max}(m, h, n)$ and $E_{\min}(m, h, n)$.

Two related functions E^+ and E^- are defined Section 10.

The set of functions on $\mathbb{Z}^d$ with mass m at grid size h that minimize energy is denoted by $\mathcal{S}(m, h)$.

5.5. **Notation related to the variational problem.** The function Ψ_d defined in (19) is of fundamental importance in this manuscript. Two other functions, Θ and $\widehat{\Theta}$, and two related subsets of $\mathbb{R}^2$, $\mathcal{R}(E, m, h)$ and $\mathcal{M}(E, m, h)$, are defined in the beginning of Section 10. All of these are used repeatedly in the manuscript.

5.6. **Continuum image of a function.** Given a function $v : \mathbb{Z}^d \to \mathbb{C}$, its "continuum image at grid size h" is defined in Section 2, but let us repeat the definition here. The continuum image at grid size h is a function $\tilde{v} : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{C}$ defined as follows. Given $y = (y_1, \ldots, y_d) \in \mathbb{R}^d$, let $x = (x_1, \ldots, x_d)$ be the unique point in $\mathbb{Z}^d$ such that for each i,

$$x_i \leq y_i/h < x_i + 1,$$

and let $\tilde{v}(y) := v(x)$. When v is a function on V_n, we define the continuum image by first defining the function to be zero on $\mathbb{Z}^d \backslash V_n$, and then defining the continuum image as above.

6. Comparison with a Gaussian function

Let $\phi = (\phi(x))_{x\in V_n}$ be a collection of i.i.d. complex Gaussian random variables, with $\mathbb{E}(\phi(x)) = \mathbb{E}(\phi(x)^2) = 0$ and

$$\mathbb{E}|\phi(x)|^2 = \frac{1}{(nh)^d}.$$

Recall the function $f_{\epsilon,h,n}$ and the set $S_{\epsilon,h,n}(E,m)$ defined in Section 2. The following basic lemma connects the properties of ϕ with that of $f_{\epsilon,h,n}$.

Lemma 6. *Take any $m > 0$ and $E \in \mathbb{R}$. Let $f = f_{\epsilon,h,n}$ and $S = S_{\epsilon,h,n}(E,m)$ for simplicity. Then for any $A \subseteq S$,*

$$\mathbb{P}(f\in A) \le e^{2n^d\epsilon}\frac{\mathbb{P}(\phi\in A)}{\mathbb{P}(\phi\in S)}.$$

Proof. For any measurable $A \subseteq \mathbb{C}^{V_n}$,

$$\mathbb{P}(f\in A) = \frac{\mathrm{Vol}(A)}{\mathrm{Vol}(S)}.$$

Now, $|M_{h,n}(v) - m| \le \epsilon$ when $v \in S$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}(\phi\in S) &= \int_S \frac{(nh)^{dn^d} e^{-n^d M_{h,n}(v)}}{\pi^{n^d}}dv\\ &\le (n^d h^d \pi^{-1})^{n^d} e^{-n^d(m-\epsilon)}\mathrm{Vol}(S).\end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}(\phi\in A) &= \int_A \frac{e^{-n^d M_{h,n}(v)}}{\pi^{n^d} h^{-dn^d/2}}dv\\ &\ge (n^d h^d \pi^{-1})^{n^d} e^{-n^d(m+\epsilon)}\mathrm{Vol}(A).\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. □

7. Diagonalizing the Laplacian

Let $\Gamma = (\Gamma(x,y))_{x,y\in V_n}$ be the matrix defined as

$$\Gamma(x,y) = \begin{cases} 2d & \text{if } x = y,\\ -1 & \text{if } x\sim y,\\ 0 & \text{in all other cases.}\end{cases}$$

The matrix Γ may be viewed as an operator acting on $\mathbb{C}^{V_n}$ in the natural sense. The action of Γ on a function $f : V_n \to \mathbb{C}$ will be denoted by Γf. Notice that $\Gamma = -h^2\Delta$, where Δ is the discrete Laplacian on the torus V_n with grid size h, as defined in (16), and that Γ is a real symmetric matrix of order n^d. In this section, we will write down the spectral decomposition of Γ.

For two functions $u, v \in \mathbb{C}^{V_n}$, let (u,v) be the standard inner product,

$$(u,v) := \sum_{x\in V_n} u(x)\overline{v(x)},$$

where $\overline{v(x)}$ is the complex conjugate of $v(x)$. Notice that for any v,

$$(v,\Gamma v) = (\Gamma v, v) = \sum_{\substack{x,y\in V_n\\ x\sim y}} |v(x)-v(y)|^2.$$

We use the notation x_i to denote the ith coordinate of a vector $x\in\mathbb{R}^d$.

Lemma 7. *For each $y=(y_1,\ldots,y_d)\in V_n$, let ρ_y be the function*

$$\rho_y(x) := n^{-d/2}e^{\mathrm{i}2\pi(y_1x_1+\cdots+y_dx_d)/n}.$$

Then the functions $(\rho_y)_{y\in V_n}$ form a complete orthonormal system of eigenfunctions of Γ, and the eigenvalue corresponding to ρ_y is

$$\lambda_y := 4\sum_{i=1}^d \sin^2(\pi y_i/n).$$

Proof. To prove orthogonality, first notice that for any $k\in\mathbb{Z}$, $r := e^{\mathrm{i}2\pi k/n}$ is an nth root of unity, and hence

$$\sum_{j=0}^{n-1} e^{\mathrm{i}2\pi kj/n} = \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} r^j = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } k\neq 0,\\ n & \text{if } k=0.\end{cases}$$

Thus, for any $y,y'\in V_n$,

$$\begin{aligned}(\rho_y,\rho_{y'}) &= n^{-d}\sum_{x_1,\ldots,x_d=0}^{n-1} e^{\mathrm{i}2\pi((y_1-y_1')x_1+\cdots+(y_d-y_d')x_d)/n}\\ &= n^{-d}\prod_{i=1}^d\sum_{x_i=0}^{n-1} e^{\mathrm{i}2\pi(y_i-y_i')x_i/n}\\ &= \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } y\neq y',\\ 1 & \text{if } y=y'.\end{cases}\end{aligned}$$

To show that ρ_y is an eigenfunction of Γ with eigenvalue λ_y, note that for any $x\in V_n$,

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma\rho_y(x) &= \sum_{z\,:\,z\sim x}(\rho_y(x)-\rho_y(z))\\ &= \sum_{i=1}^d(2-e^{\mathrm{i}2\pi y_i/n}-e^{-\mathrm{i}2\pi y_i/n})\rho_y(x)\\ &= -\rho_y(x)\sum_{i=1}^d(e^{\mathrm{i}\pi y_i/n}-e^{-\mathrm{i}\pi y_i/n})^2 = 4\rho_y(x)\sum_{i=1}^d\sin^2(\pi y_i/n).\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of the lemma. □

Let $R \in \mathbb{C}^{V_n \times V_n}$ be the matrix whose yth column is ρ_y, for each $y \in V$. Note that R is a unitary matrix. Let $\Lambda \in \mathbb{C}^{V_n \times V_n}$ be the diagonal matrix whose yth diagonal element is λ_y. Then

$$\Gamma = R\Lambda R^*,$$

where R^* is the adjoint of R. This is the spectral decomposition of Γ.

8. The set of possible energies for a given mass

Let $E_{\min}(m, h, n)$ and $E_{\max}(m, h, n)$ be the minimum and maximum possible energies at grid size h of a function $f : V_n \to \mathbb{C}$ with mass m. Since the map $f \mapsto H_{h,n}(f)$ is continuous and $\{f : M_{h,n}(f) = m\}$ is a compact connected subset of $\mathbb{C}^{V_n}$, therefore for every $E \in [E_{\min}(m, h, n), E_{\max}(m, h, n)]$, there exists some f on V_n with mass m and energy E at grid size h. Recall that $E_{\min}(m, h)$ and $E_{\max}(m, h)$ are the infimum and supremum of the set of possible energies of functions with mass m on the full lattice $\mathbb{Z}^d$, at grid size h.

Lemma 8. *For any $m \geq 0$, and any $E \in (E_{\min}(m, h), E_{\max}(m, h))$, there is a function $f : \mathbb{Z}^d \to \mathbb{C}$ such that $M_h(f) = m$ and $H_h(f) = E$. Moreover, for any $m \geq 0$, any function on $\mathbb{Z}^d$ with mass m and energy E (at grid size h) satisfies*

$$|E| \leq C(p, d, h)(m + m^{(p+1)/2}).$$

Proof. If $M_h(f) = m$, then for any x, $|f(x)|^2 \leq mh^{-d}$. Therefore,

$$|f(x)|^{p+1} \leq (mh^{-d})^{(p-1)/2}|f(x)|^2.$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} H_h(f) &\leq 2dh^{d-2} \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} |f(x)|^2 + \frac{(mh^{-d})^{(p-1)/2} h^d}{p+1} \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} |f(x)|^2 \\ &= 2dh^{-2}m + \frac{h^{-d(p-1)/2} m^{(p+1)/2}}{p+1}. \end{aligned}$$

This proves the inequality.

Next, take any two functions $f, g \in \mathbb{C}^{\mathbb{Z}^d}$ with $M_h(f) = M_h(g) = m > 0$. If $f = g$ or $f = -g$, then $H_h(f) = H_h(g)$. Suppose that $f \neq \pm g$. For each $\theta \in [0, 1]$, let $f_\theta := \theta f + (1 - \theta)g$. Since $M_h(f) = M_h(g)$ and $f \neq -g$, it is easy to see that f_θ is not the zero function for any θ. In particular, $M_h(f_\theta) > 0$. Let

$$w_\theta(x) := \sqrt{\frac{m}{M_h(f_\theta)}} f_\theta(x) \quad \text{for } x \in \mathbb{Z}^d.$$

Then $M_h(w_\theta) = m$ for all θ. Moreover, it is easy to prove that $H_h(w_\theta)$ varies continuously from $H_h(g)$ to $H_h(f)$ as θ varies from 0 to 1. This shows that for every $E \in (E_{\min}(m, h), E_{\max}(m, h))$, there is a function f with $M_h(f) = m$ and $H_h(f) = E$. $\square$

Lemma 9. *As* $n \to \infty$, $E_{\min}(m,h,n)$ *tends to* $E_{\min}(m,h)$ *and* $E_{\max}(m,h,n)$ *tends to* $E_{\max}(m,h)$. *Moreover, in both cases, the convergence is uniform on compact subsets of* $[0,\infty)$ *(for the parameter* m*, keeping* h *fixed). The functions* $E_{\max}(\cdot,h)$ *and* $E_{\min}(\cdot,h)$ *are absolutely continuous on* $[0,\infty)$.

Proof. Take any $\epsilon > 0$. Let $f \in \mathbb{C}^{\mathbb{Z}^d}$ be a function such that $M_h(f) = m$ and $H_h(f) \le E_{\min}(m,h) + \epsilon$. For each n, define a function f_n on V_n as simply the restriction of f on V_n. Then it is easy to see that $M_{h,n}(f_n) \to M_h(f)$ and $H_{h,n}(f_n) \to H_h(f)$ as $n \to \infty$. Since ϵ is arbitrary, this shows that

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} E_{\min}(m,h,n) \le E_{\min}(m,h).$$

Next, fix n and a function $f \in \mathbb{C}^{V_n}$ such that $M_{h,n}(f) = m$ and $H_{h,n}(f) \le E_{\min}(m,h,n) + \epsilon$. Define a function g on $\mathbb{Z}^d$ as follows. For each $x \in V_n$, let f_x be the translated function $f_x(y) := f(x+y)$, where the addition is modulo n in each coordinate. Let ∂V_n denote the boundary of V_n when V_n is considered as a subset of $\mathbb{Z}^d$. Recall the notation $M_{h,n}(f,U)$ from Section 5. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{x\in V_n} M_{h,n}(f_x, \partial V_n) &= \sum_{x\in V_n}\sum_{y\in \partial V_n} h^d |f(x+y)|^2 \\ &= \sum_{z\in V_n} h^d |f(z)|^2 |\partial V_n| = M_{h,n}(f)|\partial V_n|.\end{aligned}$$

This shows that there exists $x \in V_n$ such that

$$M_{h,n}(f_x, \partial V_n) \le M_{h,n}(f)|\partial V_n| n^{-d} \le C(d,m)n^{-1}.$$

Take such an x and define $g : \mathbb{Z}^d \to \mathbb{C}$ as

$$g(y) := \begin{cases} f_x(y) & \text{if } y \in V_n, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.}\end{cases}$$

Clearly, $M_h(g) = m$. Since x was chosen so that the 'boundary effect' is small, $|H_h(g) - H_{h,n}(f_x)| \le C(d,m,h)n^{-1}$. Since ϵ is arbitrary and $H_{h,n}(f_x) = H_{h,n}(f) \le E_{\min}(m,h,n) + \epsilon$, this shows that

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} E_{\min}(m,h,n) \ge E_{\min}(m,h).$$

The proof for $E_{\max}$ is similar.

To prove uniform convergence on compact subsets of $[0,\infty)$, we will first prove it for compact subsets of $(0,\infty)$. We will show that the collection of functions $(E_{\min}(\cdot,h,n))_{n\ge 1}$ is equi-Lipschitz continuous on any compact subinterval of $(0,\infty)$ and apply the Arzela-Ascoli theorem. This will also prove absolute continuity of the function $E_{\min}$ on $(0,\infty)$. Continuity at zero follows from Lemma 8. The result for $E_{\max}$ follows similarly.

Take any n and $0 < a < b$. Take $a \le m' < m \le b$. Let f be an energy minimizing function (at grid size h) of mass m on the torus V_n. Let

$f' := (m'/m)^{1/2} f$. Then $M_{h,n}(f') = m'$. Note that

$$H_{h,n}(f') = (m'/m) G_{h,n}(f) + (m'/m)^{(p+1)/2} N_{h,n}(f).$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}&|H_{h,n}(f') - H_{h,n}(f)| \\ &\le |(m'/m) - 1| G_{h,n}(f) + |(m'/m)^{(p+1)/2} - 1| N_{h,n}(f).\end{aligned}$$

Since $N_{h,n}(f)$ and $G_{h,n}(f)$ can both be bounded above by

$$C_1(p,d,h) m^{C_2(p,d,h)},$$

this shows that

$$E_{\min}(m', h, n) \le E_{\min}(m,h,n) + C(a,b,p,d,h)|m' - m|.$$

Similarly, taking g' such that $M_{h,n}(g') = m'$ and $H_{h,n}(g') = E_{\min}(m',h,n)$, and letting $g := (m/m')g'$, it follows that $E_{\min}(m,h,n)$ is bounded above by $E_{\min}(m',h,n) + C(a,b,p,d,h)|m' - m|$. This proves uniform convergence on compact subsets of $(0,\infty)$. To prove uniform convergence on compact subsets of $[0,\infty)$, one simply notices that the uniform bound on the energy given in Lemma 8 holds for functions on V_n as well (the bound will be same, independent of n). $\square$

Recall that we say $a_j \sim b_j$ as $j \to \infty$ if a_j and b_j are sequences that satisfy $\lim_{j\to\infty} a_j/b_j = 1$.

Lemma 10. *Let c_j be a sequence such that for some $C > 0$ and $\alpha \ge 0$, $c_j \sim Cj^\alpha$ as $j \to \infty$. Then for any $\beta \ge 0$,*

$$\sum_{j=0}^{k-1} c_j (k-j)^\beta \sim C k^{\alpha+\beta+1} \int_0^1 x^\alpha (1-x)^\beta dx \quad \text{as } k \to \infty.$$

Proof. Writing

$$\sum_{j=0}^{k-1} c_j (k-j)^\beta = k^{\alpha+\beta+1} \frac{1}{k} \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} (c_j/k^\alpha)(1 - j/k)^\beta,$$

note that

$$\begin{aligned}&\left|\frac{1}{k}\sum_{j=0}^{k-1}(c_j/k^\alpha)(1-j/k)^\beta - \frac{C}{k}\sum_{j=0}^{k-1}(j/k)^\alpha(1-j/k)^\beta\right| \\ &\le \frac{1}{k}\sum_{j=0}^{k-1}\frac{|c_j - Cj^\alpha|}{k^\alpha} \\ &\le \frac{1}{k}\sum_{j=0}^{k-1}\frac{|c_j - Cj^\alpha|}{(j+1)^\alpha}.\end{aligned}$$

Since $c_j/Cj^\alpha \to 1$ as $j \to \infty$, the above bound tends to zero as $k \to \infty$. Riemann sum approximation gives

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \frac{C}{k}\sum_{j=0}^{k-1}(j/k)^\alpha(1-j/k)^\beta = C\int_0^1 x^\alpha(1-x)^\beta dx.$$

This completes the proof. □

Lemma 11. *Suppose that* $1 < p < 1+4/d$. *Then for any* $m > 0$ *and* $A > 0$,

$$\sup_{0<h\le A} E_{\min}(m,h) < 0.$$

Proof. Fix $m > 0$. For each positive integer k, define a function f_k as follows. If $|x|_1 \ge k$, let $f_k(x) = 0$. If $|x|_1 < k$, let

$$f_k(x) = A_k(k - |x|_1),$$

where A_k is a positive constant such that $M_h(f_k) = m$. Since the number of vertices x with $|x|_1 = j$ asymptotes to $C(d)j^{d-1}$ as $j \to \infty$, it follows from Lemma 10 that

$$A_k^2 \sim C(d,m)h^{-d}k^{-(d+2)} \quad \text{as } k \to \infty.$$

Note that if x and y are neighboring points, then $f_k(x) \ne f_k(y)$ if and only if one of them has ℓ^1 norm j and the other has ℓ^1 norm $j+1$, for some $0 \le j < k$. And in that case,

$$|f_k(x) - f_k(y)| = A_k.$$

There are $\sim C(d)j^{d-1}$ such pairs as $j \to \infty$. Thus, again by Lemma 10,

$$G(f_k) \sim C(d)h^{d-2}A_k^2\sum_{j=0}^{k-1} j^{d-1} \sim C(d,m)h^{d-2}A_k^2k^d \sim C(d,m)(hk)^{-2}.$$

Again by Lemma 10,

$$\begin{aligned}
h^d\sum_{x\in\mathbb{Z}^d}|f_k(x)|^{p+1} &= h^d\sum_{j=0}^{k-1}\sum_{x\,:\,|x|_1=j}|f_k(x)|^{p+1}\\
&\sim C(d)h^dA_k^{p+1}\sum_{j=0}^{k-1} j^{d-1}(k-j)^{p+1}\\
&\sim C(p,d,m)h^{d-d(p+1)/2}k^{-(d+2)(p+1)/2}k^{p+d+1}\\
&= C(p,d,m)(hk)^{-d(p-1)/2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, for all k,

$$H(f_k) \le C_1(p,d,m)(hk)^{-2} - C_2(p,d,m)(hk)^{-d(p-1)/2}.$$

If $p < 1+4/d$, then $d(p-1)/2 < 2$. It is now easy to see from the above bound that if $h \le A$ for some constant A, then

$$E_{\min}(m,h) \le \inf_k H(f_k) \le -C(p,d,m,A) < 0,$$

which concludes the proof. ☐

Lemma 12. *For any* $m > 0$, $E_{\max}(m,h) = 2dm/h^2$.

Proof. Fix n. Let Γ, R and Λ be the matrices from Section 7. Let

$$\lambda_{\max} := \max_{y\in V_n} \lambda_y = \max_{y\in V_n} \sum_{i=1}^d 4\sin^2(\pi y_i/n).$$

Clearly, $\lambda_{\max} \le 4d$ always, and $\lambda_{\max} \to 4d$ as $n\to\infty$. Note that for any $f \in \mathbb{C}^{V_n}$ with $M_{h,n}(f) = m$,

$$\begin{aligned} H_{h,n}(f) &\le \frac{h^{d-2}}{2} \sum_{\substack{x,y\in V_n\\ x\sim y}} |f(x)-f(y)|^2 \\ &= \frac{h^{d-2}}{2}(f,\Gamma f) \\ &\le \frac{h^{d-2}}{2}\lambda_{\max} \sum_{x\in V_n} |f(x)|^2 = \frac{\lambda_{\max} m}{2h^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $E_{\max}(m,h,n) \le 2dm/h^2$.

Next, let $f := \sqrt{mh^{-d}}\rho_{[n/2]}$, where $(\rho_y)_{y\in V_n}$ are the eigenfunctions defined in Section 7 and $[n/2]$ is the element of V_n whose components are all equal to the integer part of $n/2$. Note that $|f(x)| = \sqrt{mh^{-d}}n^{-d/2}$ for each x. Therefore, $M_{h,n}(f) = m$ and

$$\begin{aligned} H_{h,n}(f) &= \frac{h^{d-2}}{2} \sum_{\substack{x,y\in V_n\\ x\sim y}} |f(x)-f(y)|^2 - \frac{h^d}{p+1}\sum_{x\in V_n} |f(x)|^{p+1} \\ &= \frac{h^{d-2}}{2}(f,\Gamma f) - \frac{h^d}{p+1}(mh^{-d})^{(p+1)/2} n^{-d(p-1)/2} \\ &= \frac{h^{d-2}\lambda_{[n/2]}}{2}\sum_{x\in V_n} |f(x)|^2 - \frac{h^d}{p+1}(mh^{-d})^{(p+1)/2} n^{-d(p-1)/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\lambda_{[n/2]} \to 4d$ as $n \to \infty$ and the second term goes to zero, this shows that

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} E_{\max}(m,h,n) \ge \frac{2dm}{h^2}.$$

By Lemma 9, this completes the proof. ☐

9. LARGE DEVIATIONS FOR THE GRADIENT

Recall the function Ψ_d defined in the statement of Theorem 5. The following proposition summarizes some important properties of this function.

Proposition 13. *The function* Ψ_d *has the following properties: it is continuous in* $(0, 4d)$*, it is strictly decreasing in* $(0, 2d]$ *and strictly increasing in* $[2d, 4d)$*,* $\Psi_d(2d) = 0$*, and*

$$\lim_{\alpha \downarrow 0} \Psi_d(\alpha) = \infty = \lim_{\alpha \uparrow 4d} \Psi_d(\alpha).$$

In particular, Ψ_d *is a continuous function from* $\mathbb{R}$ *into* $[0, \infty]$*.*

Proof. It is obvious from the definition that Ψ is strictly decreasing in $(0, 2d)$ and by symmetry, strictly increasing in $(2d, 4d)$. To extend the monotonicity up to the point $2d$, we have to show that $\Psi(\alpha) > 0$ for all $\alpha < 2d$. For each $\alpha \le 2d$ and $0 < \gamma < 1$ define

$$K_\alpha(\gamma) := \int_{[0,1]^d} \log\biggl(1 - \gamma + \frac{4\gamma}{\alpha} \sum_{i=1}^d \sin^2(\pi x_i)\biggr) dx_1 \cdots dx_d,$$

so that

$$\Psi_d(\alpha) = \sup_{0<\gamma<1} K_\alpha(\gamma). \tag{21}$$

By dominated convergence, K_α is continuous on $[0, 1)$ and differentiable in $(0, 1)$, and has a right derivative at 0. Moreover, $K_\alpha(0) = 0$. A simple computation shows that $K'_\alpha(0) = 2d/\alpha - 1 > 0$ if $\alpha < 2d$. Thus if $\alpha < 2d$, then K_α is strictly increasing at 0 and therefore by (21), $\Psi_d(\alpha)$ is positive. By symmetry, $\Psi_d(\alpha)$ is positive for $\alpha \in (2d, 4d)$ also.

Next, let α_n be a sequence converging to $\alpha \in (0, 2d)$. By dominated convergence, $K_{\alpha_n} \to K_\alpha$ pointwise in $[0, 1)$. It is easily seen that K_{α_n} is a strictly concave function for every n. By concavity and pointwise convergence, it follows that $\sup_{0<\gamma<1} K_{\alpha_n}(\gamma)$ converges to $\sup_{0<\gamma<1} K_\alpha(\gamma)$, proving that Ψ_d is continuous at α. To show continuity at $2d$, follow the same argument and simply note that K_{2d} attains its maximum at 0, since K_{2d} is concave in $[0, 1)$ and $K'_{2d}(0) = 0$.

Lastly, note that for any fixed $\gamma \in (0, 1)$, $K_\alpha(\gamma) \to \infty$ as $\alpha \to 0$. This proves that $\lim_{\alpha\downarrow 0} \Psi_d(\alpha) = \infty$. By symmetry, $\lim_{\alpha\uparrow 4d} \Psi_d(\alpha) = \infty$. □

Next, let $\xi = (\xi(x))_{x\in V_n}$ be a random function chosen uniformly from the unit sphere

$$\biggl\{u \in \mathbb{C}^{V_n} : \sum_{x\in V_n} |u(x)|^2 = 1\biggr\}.$$

The following theorem is a large deviation result for the gradient of ξ that is of fundamental importance in the rest of the manuscript.

Theorem 14. *For each* $\alpha \in (0, 2d)$*,*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n^d} \log \mathbb{P}\biggl(\sum_{\substack{x,y\in V_n \\ x\sim y}} |\xi(x) - \xi(y)|^2 \le \alpha\biggr) = -\Psi_d(\alpha).$$

Moreover, for any $\delta > 0$*, the same limit holds for*

$$\frac{1}{n^d}\log \mathbb{P}\biggl(\sum_{\substack{x,y\in V_n\\ x\sim y}} |\xi(x)-\xi(y)|^2 \le \alpha,\ \max_{x\in V_n}|\xi(x)|^2 \le n^{-d(1-\delta)}\biggr).$$

The same conclusions hold if $\alpha \in (2d,\infty)$ *and the '*$\le \alpha$*' is replaced by '*$\ge \alpha$*' in both expressions.*

Proof of Theorem 14 *in the case* $0<\alpha<2d$. Fix $\alpha\in(0,2d)$ and a positive integer n. Let ϕ be the Gaussian random function defined in Section 6. Let Γ, R and Λ be the matrices defined in Section 7. Let

$$\tau := R^*\phi, \tag{22}$$

where R^* is the adjoint of R. Since R is a unitary matrix, τ has the same distribution as ϕ. Moreover,

$$\sum_{y\in V_n} |\tau(y)|^2 = \sum_{x\in V_n}|\phi(x)|^2 \tag{23}$$

and

$$\sum_{y\in V_n}\lambda_y|\tau(y)|^2 = (\phi,\Gamma\phi) = \sum_{\substack{x,y\in V_n\\ x\sim y}}|\phi(x)-\phi(y)|^2. \tag{24}$$

Let

$$\xi(x) := \frac{\phi(x)}{\bigl(\sum_{y\in V_n}|\phi(y)|^2\bigr)^{1/2}}.$$

Then ξ is uniformly distributed on the unit sphere of $\mathbb{C}^{V_n}$. Moreover, by (23) and (24),

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{\substack{x,y\in V_n\\ x\sim y}}|\xi(x)-\xi(y)|^2 &= \frac{\sum_{\substack{x,y\in V_n\\ x\sim y}}|\phi(x)-\phi(y)|^2}{\sum_{x\in V_n}|\phi_x|^2}\\ &= \frac{\sum_{y\in V_n}\lambda_y|\tau(y)|^2}{\sum_{y\in V_n}|\tau(y)|^2}.\end{aligned}$$

Let $\eta(y) := n^dh^d|\tau(y)|^2$. Then $\eta(y)$ is an exponential random variable with mean 1 and the $\eta(y)$'s are independent. For any $\alpha\in(0,2d)$,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}\biggl(\sum_{\substack{x,y\in V_n\\ x\sim y}}|\xi(x)-\xi(y)|^2\le\alpha\biggr) &= \mathbb{P}\biggl(\sum_{y\in V_n}(\lambda_y-\alpha)|\tau(y)|^2\le 0\biggr)\\ &= \mathbb{P}\biggl(\sum_{y\in V_n}(\lambda_y-\alpha)\eta(y)\le 0\biggr).\end{aligned}$$

Thus, for any $\theta \in [0, 1/\alpha)$,

$$\mathbb{P}\biggl(\sum_{\substack{x,y\in V_n\\ x\sim y}} |\xi(x)-\xi(y)|^2 \le \alpha\biggr) \le \mathbb{E}(e^{-\theta\sum_{y\in V_n}(\lambda_y-\alpha)\eta(y)}) \\ = \prod_{y\in V_n} \frac{1}{1+\theta(\lambda_y-\alpha)}.$$

Note that we need the restriction that $\theta < 1/\alpha$ since $\lambda_0 = 0$. Now,

$$-\frac{1}{n^d}\log \prod_{y\in V_n} \frac{1}{1+\theta(\lambda_y-\alpha)} \\ = \frac{1}{n^d}\sum_{y_1,\ldots,y_d=0}^{n-1} \log\biggl(1-\theta\alpha+4\theta\sum_{i=1}^d \sin^2(\pi y_i/n)\biggr) =: I_n(\theta). \tag{25}$$

The sequence of functions I_n converges pointwise to the function I on $[0, 1/\alpha)$, where

$$I(\theta) = \int_{[0,1]^d} \log\biggl(1-\theta\alpha+4\theta\sum_{i=1}^d \sin^2(\pi x_i)\biggr)dx_1\cdots dx_d.$$

This shows that for each $\theta \in [0, 1/\alpha)$,

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n^d}\log \mathbb{P}\biggl(\sum_{\substack{x,y\in V_n\\ x\sim y}} |\xi(x)-\xi(y)|^2 \le \alpha\biggr) \le -I(\theta). \tag{26}$$

Now, $I(\theta) = K_\alpha(\theta\alpha)$, where K_α is defined in the proof of Proposition 13. By (21) and (26), this shows that

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n^d}\log \mathbb{P}\biggl(\sum_{\substack{x,y\in V_n,\\ x\sim y}} |\xi(x)-\xi(y)|^2 \le \alpha\biggr) \\ \le -\sup_{\theta\in(0,1/\alpha)} I(\theta) = -\sup_{\theta\in(0,1/\alpha)} K_\alpha(\theta\alpha) = -\Psi_d(\alpha). \tag{27}$$

This proves the upper bound in the case $0 < \alpha < 2d$. Next, we establish the matching lower bound.

As noted in Proposition 13, K_α is a concave function and is strictly increasing at 0 if $\alpha < 2d$. Thus, the maximum of I in $[0, 1/\alpha)$ must be achieved either inside $(0, 1/\alpha)$, or as $\theta \to 1/\alpha$. The first case holds if $I'(1/\alpha) < 0$, and the second happens if $I'(1/\alpha) \ge 0$. The proof of the lower bound is different in the two cases.

Case 1: $I'(1/\alpha) < 0$.

In this case, there is a unique $\theta^* \in (0, 1/\alpha)$ where I is maximum. Fix any $\epsilon > 0$, and let θ' be a point so close to θ^* from the right that $I'(\theta') \in (-\epsilon, 0)$. Fixing n, let $\eta' = (\eta'(y))_{y\in V_n}$ be a collection of independent random variables, where $\eta'(y)$ is an Exponential random variable with mean $1/(1+$

$\theta'(\lambda_y - \alpha))$. Assume that η' is defined on the same probability space as all other variables, and is independent of everything else.

Recall the definition (22) of τ. Let $\sigma(y) := \tau(y)/|\tau(y)|$. Since $\tau(y)$ is a complex Gaussian random variable with mean zero, $\sigma(y)$ and $|\tau(y)|$ are independent random variables. Note that

$$\tau(y) = \sigma(y)|\tau(y)| = \sigma(y)\sqrt{\frac{\eta(y)}{n^d h^d}}.$$

Define a random vector $\xi' = (\xi'(x))_{x\in V_n}$ as follows: Take the variables $\sigma(y)$ and $\eta'(y)$ defined above, and let

$$\tau'(y) := \sigma(y)\sqrt{\frac{\eta'(y)}{n^d h^d}}.$$

Let $\phi' := R\tau'$, and let

$$\xi'(x) := \frac{\phi'(x)}{\left(\sum_{y\in V_n}|\phi'(y)|^2\right)^{1/2}} = \frac{\phi'(x)}{\left(\sum_{y\in V_n}|\tau'(y)|^2\right)^{1/2}}.$$

Note that τ', just like τ, is a collection of independent complex Gaussian random variables with $\mathbb{E}(\tau'(y)) = \mathbb{E}(\tau'(y)^2) = 0$ for each y, but unlike τ,

$$\mathbb{E}|\tau'(y)|^2 = \frac{1}{n^d h^d(1+\theta'(\lambda_y - \alpha))}. \tag{28}$$

Consequently, ϕ' is a complex Gaussian random vector satisfying

$$\mathbb{E}|\phi'(x)|^2 \le \frac{1}{n^d h^d(1-\theta'\alpha)} \quad \text{for all } x, \tag{29}$$

but its components are not independent.

Note that the map that takes (σ, η) to ξ is the same map as the one that takes (σ, η') to ξ'. Therefore a simple change-of-measure computation shows that for any measurable set $A \subseteq \mathbb{C}^{V_n}$,

$$\mathbb{P}(\xi \in A) = \mathbb{E}(\rho(\eta')1\{\xi' \in A\}),$$

where

$$\rho(\eta') = e^{\sum_{y\in V_n}\theta'(\lambda_y-\alpha)\eta'(y)}\prod_{y\in V_n}\frac{1}{1+\theta'(\lambda_y-\alpha)}$$

Thus, if we fix $\delta > 0$ and let E be the event

$$\begin{aligned} E := \biggl\{ -4n^d\epsilon \le \sum_{y\in V_n}(\lambda_y - \alpha)\eta'(y) \le 0, \\ \max_{x\in V_n}|\phi'(x)|^2 \le n^{-d(1-\delta)}\sum_{x\in V_n}|\tau'(x)|^2 \biggr\}, \end{aligned}$$

then

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}\biggl(\sum_{\substack{x,y\in V_n\\ x\sim y}} |\xi(x)-\xi(y)|^2 \le \alpha,\ \max_{x\in V_n}|\xi(x)|^2 \le n^{-d(1-\delta)}\biggr)\\
&= \mathbb{E}\biggl(\rho(\eta')1\biggl\{\sum_{\substack{x,y\in V_n\\ x\sim y}} |\xi'(x)-\xi'(y)|^2 \le \alpha,\ \max_{x\in V_n}|\xi'(x)|^2 \le n^{-d(1-\delta)}\biggr\}\biggr)\\
&= \mathbb{E}\biggl(\rho(\eta')1\biggl\{\sum_{y\in V_n}(\lambda_y-\alpha)\eta'(y)\le 0,\\
&\qquad\qquad \max_{x\in V_n}|\phi'(x)|^2 \le n^{-d(1-\delta)}\sum_{x\in V_n}|\tau'(x)|^2\biggr\}\biggr)\\
&\ge \mathbb{E}(\rho(\eta')1_E) \ge e^{-4n^d\theta'\epsilon}\mathbb{P}(E)\prod_{y\in V_n}\frac{1}{1+\theta'(\lambda_y-\alpha)}. \qquad (30)
\end{aligned}$$

Now, if I_n is the function defined in (25), a simple computation gives

$$I_n'(\theta') = \frac{1}{n^d}\sum_{y\in V_n}\frac{\lambda_y-\alpha}{1+\theta'(\lambda_y-\alpha)}.$$

Thus,

$$\mathbb{E}\biggl(\frac{1}{n^d}\sum_{y\in V_n}(\lambda_y-\alpha)\eta'(y)\biggr) = I_n'(\theta').$$

But by independence,

$$\mathrm{Var}\biggl(\frac{1}{n^d}\sum_{y\in V_n}(\lambda_y-\alpha)\eta'(y)\biggr) \le \frac{C(\alpha,\theta')}{n^d}.$$

In particular, the variance tends to zero as $n\to\infty$. Since $I_n'(\theta')\to I'(\theta)\in(-\epsilon,0)$, this shows that as $n\to\infty$,

$$\mathbb{P}\biggl(-4n^d\epsilon \le \sum_{y\in V_n}(\lambda_y-\alpha)\eta'(y)\le 0\biggr)\to 1. \qquad (31)$$

By the Gaussian nature of ϕ' and (29), for any $\delta'>0$,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\mathbb{P}\bigl(n^dh^d\max_{x\in V_n}|\phi'(x)|^2 \le n^{\delta' d}\bigr) = 1,$$

and similarly by (28) and the independence of the coordinates of τ',

$$\frac{1}{n^d}\sum_{y\in V_n} n^dh^d|\tau'(y)|^2 \to \int_{[0,1]^d}\frac{1}{1-\theta'\alpha+4\theta'\sum_{i=1}^d\sin^2(\pi x_i)}dx_1\cdots dx_d > 0$$
$$\text{in probability as } n\to\infty.$$

Combining the last two displays, and choosing $\delta'\in(0,\delta)$, we get

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\mathbb{P}\biggl(\max_{x\in V_n}|\phi'(x)|^2 \le n^{-d(1-\delta)}\sum_{x\in V_n}|\tau'(x)|^2\biggr) = 1. \qquad (32)$$

Therefore, by (30), (31) and (32), $\mathbb{P}(E) \to 1$ as $n \to \infty$, and hence

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n^d} \log \mathbb{P}\biggl(\sum_{\substack{x,y\in V_n\\ x\sim y}} |\xi(x)-\xi(y)|^2 \le \alpha,\ \max_{x\in V_n} |\xi(x)|^2 \le n^{-d(1-\delta)}\biggr)$$
$$\ge -4\theta'\epsilon + \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n^d} \sum_{y\in V_n} \log(1+\theta'(\lambda_y-\alpha))$$
$$= -4\theta'\epsilon - I(\theta').$$

Since ϵ is arbitrary and $\theta' \to \theta^*$ as $\epsilon \to 0$, this shows that when $\alpha \in (0,2d)$ and $I'(\alpha) < 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}&\liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n^d} \log \mathbb{P}\biggl(\sum_{\substack{x,y\in V_n\\ x\sim y}} |\xi(x)-\xi(y)|^2 \le \alpha,\ \max_{x\in V_n} |\xi(x)|^2 \le n^{-d(1-\delta)}\biggr)\\ &\ge -I(\theta^*) = -\Psi_d(\alpha).\end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

Case 2: $I'(1/\alpha) \ge 0$.

Take any $\epsilon > 0$ and let θ' solve $1-\theta'\alpha = \epsilon$. Fix n and define η', τ', ξ' and δ as in the previous case. Then as before, we arrive at the inequality (30), with E being the same event. It suffices, as before, to show that

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n^d} \log \mathbb{P}(E) \ge 0. \tag{34}$$

Let

$$X_n := \frac{1}{n^d} \sum_{y\in V_n\setminus\{0\}} (\lambda_y - \alpha)\eta'(y),$$

and

$$Y_n := \frac{(\lambda_0-\alpha)\eta'(0)}{n^d} = -\frac{\alpha\eta'(0)}{n^d}.$$

As before, it is easy to argue that $\mathrm{Var}(X_n) \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$. Again,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}(X_n) &= \frac{1}{n^d} \sum_{y\in V_n\setminus\{0\}} \frac{\lambda_y-\alpha}{1+\theta'(\lambda_y-\alpha)}\\ &\to I'(\theta') \text{ as } n\to\infty.\end{aligned}$$

Consequently, $X_n \to I'(\theta')$ in probability as $n \to \infty$.

Next let $\eta''(0)$ be an independent copy of $\eta'(0)$. Let η'' be the vector in $\mathbb{C}^{V_n}$ whose 0th component is $\eta''(0)$ and $\eta''(y) = \eta'(y)$ for every $y \ne 0$. Let τ'' and ϕ'' be obtained from (σ, η'') the same way as τ' and ϕ' were obtained from (σ, η'). Then note that ϕ'' is independent of $\eta'(0)$. Since the elements of the matrix R are bounded in absolute value by $n^{-d/2}$, and from definition we have

(a) $\phi'' = R\tau''$, $\phi' = R\tau'$,
(b) $\tau''(0) = \sigma(0)\sqrt{\eta''(0)/(nh)^d}$, $\tau'(0) = \sigma(0)\sqrt{\eta'(0)/(nh)^d}$, and
(c) $\tau''(y) = \tau'(y)$ for all $y \ne 0$,

therefore for all $x \in V_n$,

$$|\phi''(x) - \phi'(x)| \le n^{-d/2}(nh)^{-d/2}|(\eta''(0))^{1/2} - (\eta'(0))^{1/2}|. \tag{35}$$

Fix $\delta' \in (0, \delta)$ and some ϵ' so small that $-d(1-\delta') + \epsilon' < -d(1-\delta)$, and define four events:

$$\begin{aligned}
E_1 &:= \{|X_n - I'(\theta')| \le \epsilon\},\\
E_2 &:= \{-I'(\theta') - 3\epsilon \le Y_n \le -I'(\theta') - \epsilon\}\\
&= \biggl\{\frac{n^d(I'(\theta') + \epsilon)}{\alpha} \le \eta'(0) \le \frac{n^d(I'(\theta') + 3\epsilon)}{\alpha}\biggr\},\\
E_3 &:= \biggl\{(nh)^d \max_{x \in V_n} |\phi''(x)|^2 \le n^{\delta' d},\ \frac{1}{n^d}\sum_{x \in V_n \setminus \{0\}} (nh)^d |\tau''(x)|^2 \ge n^{-\epsilon'}\biggr\},\\
E_4 &:= \{|\eta''(0)| \le n^d\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Then by (35), $E_2 \cap E_3 \cap E_4$ implies that for each x,

$$\begin{aligned}
|\phi'(x)|^2 &\le 2|\phi''(x)|^2 + 2|\phi'(x) - \phi''(x)|^2\\
&\le (nh)^{-d}(2n^{\delta' d} + C(\alpha, \epsilon)).
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\tau''(x) = \tau'(x)$ for all $x \ne 0$, this shows that for all $n \ge C(\alpha, \epsilon, \delta', \epsilon')$, $E_2 \cap E_3 \cap E_4$ implies

$$\max_{x \in V_n} |\phi'(x)|^2 \le n^{-d(1-\delta')+\epsilon'} \sum_{x \in V_n \setminus \{0\}} |\tau'(x)|^2 \le n^{-d(1-\delta)} \sum_{x \in V_n} |\tau'(x)|^2.$$

Again, $E_1 \cap E_2$ implies $-4\epsilon \le X_n + Y_n \le 0$, which is the same as

$$-4n^d\epsilon \le \sum_{y \in V_n} (\lambda_y - \alpha)\eta'(y) \le 0.$$

Thus, for all $n \ge C(\alpha, \epsilon, \delta', \epsilon', \delta)$, $E_1 \cap E_2 \cap E_3 \cap E_4$ implies E. So, to show (34), it suffices to show that

$$\liminf_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n^d} \log \mathbb{P}(E_1 \cap E_2 \cap E_3 \cap E_4) \ge 0. \tag{36}$$

Since $\eta'(0)$ is an Exponential random variable with mean $1/\epsilon$, it is easy to see that

$$\mathbb{P}(E_2) \ge \frac{2n^d\epsilon^2}{\alpha} \exp\biggl(-\frac{\epsilon n^d(I'(\theta') + 3\epsilon)}{\alpha}\biggr).$$

As argued above, $X_n \to I'(\theta')$ in probability and therefore $\mathbb{P}(E_1) \to 1$ as $n \to \infty$. The probability of E_4 tends to 1 trivially, and $\mathbb{P}(E_3) \to 1$ by the same logic that led to (32). Thus, $\mathbb{P}(E_1 \cap E_3 \cap E_4) \to 1$. Lastly, observe that the events E_1, E_3 and E_4 are jointly independent of E_2. Combining all of these observations, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n^d}\log \mathbb{P}(E_1\cap E_2\cap E_3\cap E_4)\\
&= \liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n^d}(\log \mathbb{P}(E_1\cap E_3\cap E_4) + \log\mathbb{P}(E_2))\\
&\ge -\frac{\epsilon(I'(\theta')+3\epsilon)}{\alpha}.
\end{aligned}$$

Since ϵ is arbitrary and $0\le I'(\theta)\le I'(0) = 2d-\alpha$ for all θ (by concavity and the assumption that $I'(1/\alpha)\ge 0$), this proves (36) and hence (34), leading to the proof of (33) when $I'(1/\alpha)\ge 0$. Combining (27) and (33), the proof of Theorem 14 for $\alpha\in(0,2d)$ is complete. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 14 *in the case* $2d<\alpha<\infty$. The proof is very similar to the previous case, with a few important modifications. Let all notation be as before. Note that for any $\alpha\in(2d,4d)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}\biggl(\sum_{\substack{x,y\in V_n\\ x\sim y}} |\xi(x)-\xi(y)|^2\ge\alpha\biggr) &= \mathbb{P}\biggl(\sum_{y\in V_n}(\lambda_y-\alpha)|\tau(y)|^2\ge 0\biggr)\\
&= \mathbb{P}\biggl(\sum_{y\in V_n}(\lambda_y-\alpha)\eta(y)\ge 0\biggr).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, for any $\theta\in[0,1/(4d-\alpha))$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}\biggl(\sum_{\substack{x,y\in V_n\\ x\sim y}} |\xi(x)-\xi(y)|^2\ge\alpha\biggr) &\le \mathbb{E}(e^{\theta\sum_{y\in V_n}(\lambda_y-\alpha)\eta(y)})\\
&= \prod_{y\in V_n}\frac{1}{1-\theta(\lambda_y-\alpha)}.
\end{aligned}$$

The condition $\theta<1/(4d-\alpha)$ ensures that the right-hand side makes sense, since λ_y is uniformly bounded above by $4d$. Now,

$$\begin{aligned}
&-\frac{1}{n^d}\log\prod_{y\in V_n}\frac{1}{1-\theta(\lambda_y-\alpha)}\\
&= \frac{1}{n^d}\sum_{y_1,\ldots,y_d=0}^{n-1}\log\biggl(1+\theta\alpha-4\theta\sum_{i=1}^d\sin^2(\pi y_i/n)\biggr) =: J_n(\theta),
\end{aligned}$$

and the sequence of functions J_n converges pointwise to the function J on $[0,1/(4d-\alpha))$, where

$$J(\theta) = \int_{[0,1]^d}\log\biggl(1+\theta\alpha-4\theta\sum_{i=1}^d\sin^2(\pi x_i)\biggr)dx_1\cdots dx_d.$$

This shows that for each $\theta \in [0, 1/(4d-\alpha))$,

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n^d} \log \mathbb{P}\biggl(\sum_{\substack{x,y\in V_n\\ x\sim y}} |\xi(x)-\xi(y)|^2 \ge \alpha\biggr) \le -J(\theta),$$

and therefore

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n^d} \log \mathbb{P}\biggl(\sum_{\substack{x,y\in V_n,\\ x\sim y}} |\xi(x)-\xi(y)|^2 \ge \alpha\biggr) \le -\sup_{\theta\in(0,1/(4d-\alpha))} J(\theta).$$

Now, putting $\gamma = (4d-\alpha)\theta$ gives

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sup_{\theta\in(0,1/(4d-\alpha))} J(\theta) = \sup_{\gamma\in(0,1)} J(\gamma/(4d-\alpha))\\
&= \sup_{\gamma\in(0,1)} \int_{[0,1]^d} \log\biggl(1+\frac{\gamma\alpha}{4d-\alpha} - \frac{4\gamma}{4d-\alpha}\sum_{i=1}^d \sin^2(\pi x_i)\biggr)dx_1\cdots dx_d\\
&= \sup_{\gamma\in(0,1)} \int_{[0,1]^d} \log\biggl(1-\gamma+\frac{4\gamma}{4d-\alpha}\sum_{i=1}^d \cos^2(\pi x_i)\biggr)dx_1\cdots dx_d.
\end{aligned}$$

The above expression is the same as $\Psi_d(4d-\alpha)$, except that we have cos instead of sin. However, this does not matter, since we can break up the hypercube $[0,1]^d$ into a union of smaller hypercubes like $[a_1, a_1+1/2]\times\cdots\times[a_d, a_d+1/2]$ where each $a_i \in \{0, 1/2\}$, and then, within each hypercube, replace cos by sin by a change of variable $y_i = 1/2 - x_i$ when $a_i = 0$ and $y_i = 3/2 - x_i$ when $a_i = 1/2$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n^d} \log \mathbb{P}\biggl(\sum_{\substack{x,y\in V_n,\\ x\sim y}} |\xi(x)-\xi(y)|^2 \ge \alpha\biggr)\\
&\le -\sup_{\theta\in(0,1/(4d-\alpha))} J(\theta) = -\Psi_d(4d-\alpha) = -\Psi_d(\alpha).
\end{aligned} \tag{37}$$

Next, we turn our attention to the lower tail. The function J is continuous in the interval $[0, 1/(4d-\alpha))$ and differentiable in $(0, 1/(4d-\alpha))$. Moreover, J is differentiable from the right at 0 and differentiable from the left at $1/(4d-\alpha)$, and an easy computation gives $J'(0) = \alpha - 2d$. Since $\alpha > 2d$ and J is continuous at 0, this shows that J must be strictly increasing in a neighborhood of 0. It is easy to check that J is a concave function. Since J is increasing at 0, its maximum in $[0, 1/(4d-\alpha))$ must be achieved either inside $(0, 1/(4d-\alpha))$, or as $\theta \to 1/(4d-\alpha)$. The first case holds if $J'(1/(4d-\alpha)) < 0$, and the second happens if $J'(1/(4d-\alpha)) \ge 0$. Just as before, the proof of the lower bound is different in the two cases.

Case 1: $J'(1/(4d-\alpha)) < 0$.

In this case, there is a unique $\theta^* \in (0, 1/(4d-\alpha))$ where J is maximum. Fix any $\epsilon > 0$, and let θ' be a point so close to θ^* from the right that $J'(\theta') \in (-\epsilon, 0)$. Given n, let $(\eta'(y))_{y\in V_n}$ be a collection of independent random variables, where $\eta'(y)$ has the Exponential distribution with mean $1/(1-\theta'(\lambda_y-\alpha))$. (Note the minus sign in front of θ', which was plus in the case $\alpha < 2d$.) As before, assume that η' is defined on the same probability space as all other variables, and is independent of everything else.

Given η', define τ', ϕ' and ξ' as before. Then all the properties of these vectors are same as before, except that now

$$\mathbb{E}|\tau'(y)|^2 = \frac{1}{(nh)^d(1-\theta'(\lambda_y-\alpha))}$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}|\phi'(x)|^2 \le \frac{1}{(nh)^d(1-\theta'(4d-\alpha))} \ \text{ for all } x \in V_n.$$

Defining

$$\rho(\eta') = e^{-\sum_{y\in V_n}\theta'(\lambda_y-\alpha)\eta'(y)}\prod_{y\in V_n}\frac{1}{1-\theta'(\lambda_y-\alpha)}.$$

Fix $\delta > 0$ and let E be the event

$$\begin{aligned} E := \biggl\{ 0 \le \sum_{y\in V_n}(\lambda_y-\alpha)\eta'(y) \le 4n^d\epsilon, \\ \max_{x\in V_n}|\phi'(x)|^2 \le n^{-d(1-\delta)}\sum_{x\in V_n}|\tau'(x)|^2\biggr\}. \end{aligned}$$

Then as before we arrive at the inequality

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}\biggl(\sum_{\substack{x,y\in V_n\\ x\sim y}}|\xi(x)-\xi(y)|^2 \ge \alpha,\ \max_{x\in V_n}|\xi(x)|^2 \le n^{-d(1-\delta)}\biggr) \\ &\ge e^{-4\theta' n^d\epsilon}\mathbb{P}(E)\prod_{y\in V_n}\frac{1}{1-\theta'(\lambda_y-\alpha)}. \end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

Exactly as before, we can now argue that

$$\frac{1}{n^d}\sum_{y\in V_n}(\lambda_y-\alpha)\eta'(y) \to -J'(\theta') \ \text{ in probability as } n\to\infty.$$

Since $J'(\theta) \in (-\epsilon, 0)$, this shows that as $n \to \infty$,

$$\mathbb{P}\biggl(0 \le \sum_{y\in V_n}(\lambda_y-\alpha)\eta'(y) \le 4n^d\epsilon\biggr) \to 1. \tag{39}$$

The inequality (32) continues to be valid, and therefore, by (38), (39) and (32),

$$\begin{aligned}
&\liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n^d} \log \mathbb{P}\biggl(\sum_{\substack{x,y\in V_n\\ x\sim y}} |\xi(x)-\xi(y)|^2 \ge \alpha,\ \max_{x\in V_n} |\xi(x)|^2 \le n^{-d(1-\delta)}\biggr)\\
&\ge -4\epsilon + \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n^d}\sum_{y\in V_n} \log(1-\theta'(\lambda_y-\alpha))\\
&= -4\epsilon - J(\theta').
\end{aligned}$$

Since ϵ is arbitrary and $\theta' \to \theta^*$ as $\epsilon \to 0$, this shows (as in (37)) that when $\alpha \in (2d, 4d)$ and $J'(1/(4d-\alpha)) < 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n^d} \log \mathbb{P}\biggl(\sum_{\substack{x,y\in V_n\\ x\sim y}} |\xi(x)-\xi(y)|^2 \ge \alpha,\ \max_{x\in V_n} |\xi(x)|^2 \le n^{-d(1-\delta)}\biggr)\\
&\qquad \ge -\Psi_d(\alpha).
\end{aligned} \tag{40}$$

Case 2: $J'(1/(4d-\alpha)) \ge 0$.

Take any $\epsilon > 0$ and let θ' solve $1-\theta'(4d-\alpha) = \epsilon$. Fix n and define η', τ' and ξ' as in the previous case. Let $[n/2]$ is the vector in $\mathbb{C}^{V_n}$ whose components are all equal to the integer part of $n/2$. Then as before, we arrive at the inequality (38), with E being the same event. Let

$$X_n := \frac{1}{n^d} \sum_{y\in V_n\setminus\{[n/2]\}} (\lambda_y-\alpha)\eta'(y),$$

and

$$Y_n := \frac{(\lambda_{[n/2]}-\alpha)\eta'([n/2])}{n^d}.$$

Note that $\lambda_{[n/2]} \to 4d$ as $n\to\infty$.

As before, it is easy to argue that $\mathrm{Var}(X_n) \to 0$ as $n\to\infty$. Again,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}(X_n) &= \frac{1}{n^d} \sum_{y\in V_n\setminus\{[n/2]\}} \frac{\lambda_y-\alpha}{1-\theta'(\lambda_y-\alpha)}\\
&\to -J'(\theta') \text{ as } n\to\infty.
\end{aligned}$$

Consequently, $X_n \to -J'(\theta')$ in probability as $n\to\infty$.

Next let $\eta''([n/2])$ be an independent copy of $\eta'([n/2])$. Let η'' be the vector in $\mathbb{C}^{V_n}$ whose $[n/2]$th component is $\eta''([n/2])$ and $\eta''(y) = \eta'(y)$ for every $y \ne [n/2]$. Let τ'' and ϕ'' be obtained from (σ,η'') the same way as τ' and ϕ' were obtained from (σ,η'). Then note that ϕ'' is independent of $\eta'(0)$. Exactly as we proved (35), it follows that for all $x\in V_n$,

$$|\phi''(x)-\phi'(x)| \le n^{-d/2}(nh)^{-d/2}|(\eta''([n/2]))^{1/2} - (\eta'([n/2]))^{1/2}|.$$

Fix $\delta' \in (0,\delta)$ and some ϵ' so small that $-d(1-\delta')+\epsilon' < -d(1-\delta)$, and define four events:

$$\begin{aligned}
E_1 &:= \{|X_n + J'(\theta')| \le \epsilon\},\\
E_2 &:= \{J'(\theta')+\epsilon \le Y_n \le J'(\theta')+3\epsilon\}\\
&= \biggl\{\frac{n^d(J'(\theta')+\epsilon)}{\lambda_{[n/2]}-\alpha} \le \eta'([n/2]) \le \frac{n^d(J'(\theta')+3\epsilon)}{\lambda_{[n/2]}-\alpha}\biggr\},\\
E_3 &:= \biggl\{(nh)^d \max_{x\in V_n}|\phi''(x)|^2 \le n^{\delta' d},\ \frac{1}{n^d}\sum_{x\in V_n\setminus\{[n/2]\}}(nh)^d|\tau''(x)|^2 \ge n^{-\epsilon'}\biggr\},\\
E_4 &:= \{\eta''([n/2]) \le n^d\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Then $E_2\cap E_3\cap E_4$ implies that for each x,

$$\begin{aligned}
|\phi'(x)|^2 &\le 2|\phi''(x)|^2 + 2|\phi'(x)-\phi''(x)|^2\\
&\le (nh)^d(2n^{\delta' d} + C(\alpha,\epsilon)).
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\tau''(x) = \tau'(x)$ for all $x \ne [n/2]$, this shows that for $n \ge C(\alpha,\epsilon,\delta',\epsilon')$, $E_2\cap E_3\cap E_4$ implies

$$\max_{x\in V_n}|\phi'(x)|^2 \le n^{-d(1-\delta)}\sum_{x\in V_n\setminus\{0\}}|\tau'(x)|^2 \le n^{-d(1-\delta)}\sum_{x\in V_n}|\tau'(x)|^2.$$

Again, $E_1\cap E_2$ implies $0 \le X_n + Y_n \le 4\epsilon$, which is the same as

$$0 \le \sum_{y\in V_n}(\lambda_y - \alpha)\eta'(y) \le 4n^d\epsilon.$$

Thus, for $n \ge C(\alpha,\epsilon,\delta',\epsilon',\delta)$, $E_1\cap E_2\cap E_3\cap E_4$ implies E. So it suffices to find a lower bound for the probability of $E_1\cap E_2\cap E_3\cap E_4$.

Since $\eta'([n/2])$ is an Exponential random variable with mean

$$\frac{1}{1-\theta'(\lambda_{[n/2]}-\alpha)},$$

and $\lambda_{[n/2]} \to 4d$ as $n\to\infty$ and by definition of θ', $1-\theta'(4d-\alpha) = \epsilon$, it is easy to see that

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n^d}\log\mathbb{P}(E_2) \ge -\frac{\epsilon(J'(\theta')+3\epsilon)}{4d-\alpha}.$$

The proof is now completed exactly as for the lower tail in the case $\alpha \in (0,2d)$. □

The following theorem is the main result of this section.

Theorem 15. *For each $\epsilon > 0$ and $\alpha > 0$,*

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n^d}\log\mathbb{P}\biggl(\biggl|\sum_{\substack{x,y\in V_n\\ x\sim y}}|\xi(x)-\xi(y)|^2 - \alpha\biggr| \le \epsilon\biggr) = -\Psi_{d,\epsilon}(\alpha),$$

where

$$\Psi_{d,\epsilon}(\alpha) = \begin{cases} \Psi_d(\alpha+\epsilon) & \text{if } \alpha \le 2d-\epsilon, \\ \Psi_d(\alpha-\epsilon) & \text{if } \alpha \ge 2d+\epsilon, \\ 0 & \text{if } 2d-\epsilon < \alpha < 2d+\epsilon. \end{cases}$$

In particular, $\Psi_{d,\epsilon}$ *converges uniformly to* Ψ_d *on compact subsets of* $(0, 4d)$ *as* $\epsilon \to 0$*. As in Theorem 14, the same limit holds if we include the additional requirement that* $\max_{x\in V_n} |\xi(x)|^2 \le n^{-d(1-\delta)}$.

Proof. Obvious from Theorem 14 and Proposition 13. □

10. The variational problem

For each $E \ge 0$, $m \ge 0$ and $h > 0$ define

$$\Theta(E, m, h) := \log m - \Psi_d\biggl(\frac{2h^2 E}{m}\biggr).$$

When $m = 0$, the right-hand side is interpreted as $-\infty$. With this definition, it is easy to verify that for fixed h, Θ is a continuous function from $[0,\infty) \times [0,\infty)$ into $[-\infty,\infty)$.

Given $m_0 > 0$ and $E_{\min}(m,h) < E_0 < E_{\max}(m,h)$ let $\mathcal{M}(E_0, m_0, h)$ denote the set of all (E, m) that maximize $\Theta(E, m, h)$ in the set

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}(E_0, m_0, h) = \{(E, m) &: 0 \le m \le m_0, \\ &\max\{E^-(m,h), 0\} \le E \le E^+(m,h)\}, \end{aligned} \tag{41}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} E^-(m,h) &:= E_0 - E_{\max}(m_0 - m, h), \\ E^+(m,h) &:= E_0 - E_{\min}(m_0 - m, h). \end{aligned} \tag{42}$$

Define

$$\widehat{\Theta}(E_0, m_0, h) := \max_{(E,m)\in\mathcal{R}(E_0,m_0,h)} \Theta(E, m, h).$$

The following lemma lists some important properties of the sets $\mathcal{R}$ and $\mathcal{M}$.

Lemma 16. *Suppose that* $E_{\min}(m_0, h) \le E_0 < dm_0/h^2$*. Then the set* $\mathcal{R}(E_0, m_0, h)$ *is a non-empty compact subset of* $\mathbb{R}^2$*, and so is* $\mathcal{M}(E_0, m_0, h)$*. Moreover, any* $(E, m) \in \mathcal{M}(E_0, m_0, h)$ *satisfies* $m \in (0, m_0]$ *and* $E = E^+(m, h)$*, where* E^+ *is defined in* (42) *above.*

Proof. From Lemma 8 and Lemma 9 it follows that $\mathcal{R}(E_0, m_0, h)$ is simply a region enclosed between the graphs of two continuous functions on a closed interval and therefore, is a compact subset of $\mathbb{R}^2$. It is clearly non-empty. By continuity of Θ, this shows that $\mathcal{M}(E_0, m_0, h)$ is also compact and non-empty.

It is obvious that $m > 0$, since $\Theta(E, m, h) = -\infty$ if $m = 0$. Let E^- and E^+ be as in (42). Let $E^*(m, h) := dm/h^2$. Lemma 12 implies that for any

$m \in [0, m_0]$,

$$\begin{aligned} E^-(m,h) &= E_0 - \frac{2d(m_0-m)}{h^2} \\ &< \frac{dm_0}{h^2} - \frac{2d(m_0-m)}{h^2} \\ &= \frac{dm}{h^2} - \frac{d(m_0-m)}{h^2} \le E^*(m,h). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, $E^*(m,h)$ is non-negative, and hence

$$E^*(m,h) \ge \max\{E^-(m,h), 0\}.$$

Now fix any $m \in [0, m_0]$. If $E^+(m,h) < 0$, then there exists no E such that $(E,m) \in \mathcal{R}(E_0, m_0, h)$, and hence no E such that $(E,m) \in \mathcal{R}(E_0, m_0, h)$. So assume that $E^+(m,h) \ge 0$. By Proposition 13, $\Theta(E,m,h)$ increases strictly as E increases from 0 to $E^*(m,h)$, and then starts decreasing as E increases further. Therefore, if we impose the restriction that $(E,m) \in \mathcal{R}(E_0, m_0, h)$, then for fixed m, $\Theta(E,m,h)$ is maximized at $\min\{E^+(m,h), E^*(m,h)\}$.

Suppose that (E,m) is a point in $\mathcal{M}(E_0, m_0, h)$ such that $E = E^*(m,h) < E^+(m,h)$. This is clearly not true if $m = m_0$, since $E^*(m_0,h) = dm_0/h^2 > E_0 = E^+(m_0,h)$. We claim that this is impossible even if $m < m_0$. Indeed, if this is true for some $m < m_0$, then since $E_{\min}$ is a continuous function by Lemma 9, we can choose a slightly larger $m' > m$ such that $E^*(m',h) < E^+(m',h)$. But then $E^*(m',h) \in [E^-(m',h), E^+(m',h)]$, and

$$\begin{aligned} \Theta(E^*(m',h), m', h) &= \log m' - \Psi_d\biggl(\frac{2h^2 E^*(m',h)}{m'}\biggr) \\ &= \log m' > \log m = \Theta(E,m,h), \end{aligned}$$

showing that (E,m) cannot belong to $\mathcal{M}(E_0, m_0, h)$. □

11. Upper bound

Fix $h > 0$, and some $E_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ and $m_0 > 0$. The numbers p, d, h, E_0 and m_0 will be fixed throughout this section and will be called the 'fixed parameters'. Any constant that depends only on the fixed parameters will be denoted simply by C, instead of $C(p, d, h, E_0, m_0)$. If the constant depends on additional parameters $a, b, \ldots$, then it will be denoted by $C(a, b, \ldots)$.

Recall the random function ϕ defined in Section 6 and the objects $\mathcal{M}$, $\mathcal{R}$, Θ and $\widehat{\Theta}$ defined in Section 10.

Take any positive integer n. For any $\delta > 0$, we will call a function $f \in \mathbb{C}^{V_n}$ a δ-soliton if there exists a $g \in \mathbb{C}^{V_n}$ such that

(a) $\|f - g\|_\infty \le \delta$, and
(b) there exists $(E^*, m^*) \in \mathcal{M}(E_0, m_0, h)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} &|(E_0 - E^*) - H_{h,n}(g)| \le \delta \quad \text{and} \\ &|(m_0 - m^*) - M_{h,n}(g)| \le \delta. \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 17. *For arbitrary* $\epsilon, \delta \in (0,1)$*, let* $B = B(\epsilon, \delta, n)$ *be the event*

$$\{|H_{h,n}(\phi) - E_0| \le \epsilon,\ |M_{h,n}(\phi) - m_0| \le \epsilon,\ \phi \text{ is not a } \delta\text{-soliton}\}.$$

Then for any fixed $\delta \in (0,1)$*,*

$$\limsup_{\epsilon \to 0} \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{\log \mathbb{P}(B(\epsilon,\delta,n))}{n^d} < 1 - m_0 + \widehat{\Theta}(E_0, m_0, h).$$

The strict inequality is the main point of the above theorem. Let us now embark on the proof of Theorem 17. We begin with two simple technical lemmas.

Lemma 18. *Let* $z_1, \ldots, z_k$ *be standard complex Gaussian random variables, where* $k \ge 2$*. Let* $S := \sum_{i=1}^k |z_i|^2$*. Then for any* $x \ge 2$ *and* $0 < y \le x/2$*,*

$$\mathbb{P}(|S - x| \le y) = \exp(k + k\log(x/k) - x + R(x,y,k)), \tag{43}$$

where

$$|R(x,y,k)| \le C\log k + C \log x + \frac{Cky}{x} + y,$$

where C *is a universal constant. Moreover,*

$$\mathbb{P}(S \le x) \le \exp(k + k\log(x/k)). \tag{44}$$

Proof. The random variable S has a Gamma density with parameters k and 1. Explicitly, the density function of S is:

$$\rho(t) = \frac{t^{k-1}e^{-t}}{(k-1)!}.$$

Let $T(x,k) := k + k\log(x/k) - x$. Note that for any $t \in [x-y, x+y]$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&|\log\rho(t) - T(x,k)| \\
&\le |\log(k-1)! - (k\log k - k)| + |\log t| + k|\log t - \log x| + |x - t| \\
&\le C\log k + C\log x + \frac{Cky}{x} + y.
\end{aligned}$$

(The assumption that $y \le x/2$ was used to bound second and third terms.) Further, note that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(|S - x| \le y) &= \int_{x-y}^{x+y} \rho(t)dt \\
&= e^{T(x,k)} \int_{x-y}^{x+y} e^{\log\rho(t) - T(x,k)} dt.
\end{aligned}$$

Using the bound from the previous display finishes the proof of the first part of the lemma. To prove the second part, note that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(S \le x) &= \int_0^x \frac{t^{k-1}e^{-t}}{(k-1)!}dt \\
&\le \int_0^x \frac{t^{k-1}}{(k-1)!}dt = \frac{x^k}{k!} \le \frac{x^k}{k^k e^{-k}}.
\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. □

Lemma 19. *Let $\Psi_{d,\epsilon}$ be the function defined in Theorem* 15*. Then for any $\alpha \in [0,\infty)$ and any $L > 0$,*

$$\Psi_{d,\epsilon}(\alpha) \geq \min\{\Psi_d(\alpha),\ L\} - a(\epsilon, L, d),$$

where $a(\epsilon, L, d)$ is a quantity that depends only on ϵ, L and d (and not on α), such that for any fixed $L > 0$, $\lim_{\epsilon\to 0} a(\epsilon, L, d) = 0$.

Proof. In this proof, $a(\epsilon, L, d)$ will denote any constant with the properties described above.

By the properties of Ψ_d listed in Proposition 13, there exist $0 < c_1 < c_2 < 4d$ such that $\Psi_d(\alpha) > L$ whenever $\alpha \notin [c_1, c_2]$. Fix c_1' and c_2' such that $0 < c_1' < c_1 < c_2 < c_2' < 4d$. Note that c_1, c_2, c_1' and c_2' can be chosen depending only on L and d. By the uniform convergence of $\Psi_{d,\epsilon}$ on compact sets, if $\alpha \in [c_1', c_2']$,

$$\Psi_{d,\epsilon}(\alpha) \geq \Psi_d(\alpha) - a(\epsilon, L, d).$$

On the other hand, by the definition of $\Psi_{d,\epsilon}$, it is easy to see that if $\alpha \notin [c_1', c_2']$, for all sufficiently small ϵ (depending only on L and d), $\Psi_{d,\epsilon}(\alpha) > L$. In particular, if $\alpha \notin [c_1', c_2']$, then

$$\Psi_{d,\epsilon}(\alpha) \geq L - a(\epsilon, L, d).$$

The proof is completed by combining the two cases. □

For a subset U of V_n, recall that U^c denotes the set $V_n \backslash U$, and ∂U denotes the set of all vertices in U that are adjacent to some vertex in U^c. Recall also the definitions of $M_{h,n}(f, U)$, $H_{h,n}(f, U)$, $N_{h,n}(f, U)$ and $G_{h,n}(f, U)$ from Section 8. The following lemma shows that the nonlinear component of any f must come from a small region.

Lemma 20. *Take any $f \in \mathbb{C}^{V_n}$. Let $m := M_{h,n}(f)$. Then, given any $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$, there exists a non-empty subset U of V_n such that*

- (i) $|U| \leq \frac{4^d m}{h^d \epsilon^{d+2}}$.
- (ii) $|f(x)| \leq \epsilon$ *for all* $x \in U^c$.
- (iii) $N_{h,n}(f, U^c) \leq \epsilon^{p-1} m$.
- (iv) $M_{h,n}(f, \partial U \cup \partial U^c) \leq 2\epsilon m$.

Proof. Let U_1 be the subset of V on which f is bigger than ϵ. If this set is empty, let U_1 be any singleton subset of V_n. Then note that $f \leq \epsilon$ outside U_1, and

$$h^d \sum_{x\in U_1^c} |f|^{p+1} \leq \epsilon^{p-1} h^d \sum_{x\in U_1^c} |f|^2 \leq \epsilon^{p-1} m.$$

Also note that

$$|U_1| \leq \frac{h^d \sum_{x\in U_1} |f(x)|^2}{h^d \epsilon^2} \leq \frac{m}{h^d \epsilon^2}.$$

Define $U_2, U_3, \ldots$ as follows: For each $i \geq 2$, let U_i be the set of vertices that are either in U_{i-1} or adjacent to a vertex in U_{i-1}. Note that $U_{i-1} \subseteq U_i$ for each i. Let $W_i := \partial U_i$. Then $W_1, W_2, \ldots$ are disjoint sets, and $W_{i+1} = \partial U_i^c$ for each $i \ge 1$. Thus, for any k,

$$\begin{aligned}\min_{1\le i\le k} h^d \sum_{x\in \partial U_i\cup \partial U_i^c} |f(x)|^2 &= \min_{1\le i\le k} h^d \sum_{x\in W_i\cup W_{i+1}} |f(x)|^2\\ &\le \frac{2h^d}{k}\sum_{i=1}^{k+1}\sum_{x\in W_i}|f(x)|^2 \le \frac{2m}{k}.\end{aligned}$$

Since each element of U_k is within ℓ^1 distance $k-1$ from some element of U_1, and the ℓ^1 ball of radius $k-1$ around any vertex has $\le (2k-1)^d$ points,

$$\max_{1\le i\le k} |U_i| = |U_k| \le (2k-1)^d |U_1|.$$

Choose an integer k such that $1/\epsilon \le k \le 2/\epsilon$. The proof is completed by choosing an i between 1 and k that minimizes $h^d\sum_{x\in\partial U_i\cup\partial U_i^c}|f_x|^2$, and defining U to be the set U_i. ☐

Given any $f \in \mathbb{C}^{V_n}$, recall that $\mathcal{U}(f,\epsilon)$ denote the set of all non-empty subsets of V_n that satisfy conditions (i) through (iv) of Lemma 20. Then Lemma 20 says that $\mathcal{U}(f,\epsilon)$ is non-empty for any $\epsilon > 0$.

Lemma 21. *For any $\epsilon \in (0,1)$, $E \ge 0$ and $m \ge 0$, let $K = K(\epsilon, n, E, m)$ be the event*

$$\begin{aligned}\{|M_{h,n}(\phi) - m_0| \le \epsilon,\ |H_{h,n}(\phi) - E_0| \le \epsilon,\ &\text{and for some } U \in \mathcal{U}(\phi,\epsilon),\\ |M_{h,n}(\phi, U^c) - m| \le \epsilon,\ &|G_{h,n}(\phi, U^c) - E| \le \epsilon\}.\end{aligned}$$

Then for any $L > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}&\limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{\log \mathbb{P}(K(\epsilon,n,E,m))}{n^d}\\ &\qquad\le \max\{1 - m_0 + \Theta(E,m,h),\ C - L\} + a(\epsilon, L),\end{aligned}$$

where C depends only on the fixed parameters, and $a(\epsilon, L)$ is a quantity that depends only on ϵ, L and the fixed parameters, such that for any $L > 0$, $\lim_{\epsilon\to 0} a(\epsilon, L) = 0$. In particular, $a(\epsilon, L)$ does not depend on E and m.

Proof. Fix $L > 0$, $E \ge 0$, $m \ge 0$ and $\epsilon \in (0,1)$. Throughout this proof, $a(\epsilon, L)$ will denote any constant with the properties outlined in the statement of the lemma, and $o(1)$ will denote any constant that depends only on ϵ, E, m, L, n and the fixed parameters, that goes to zero as $n \to \infty$ while keeping the other parameters fixed.

Choose a positive integer n and a set $U \subseteq V_n$. For notational simplicity, define

$$\begin{aligned} M &:= M_{h,n}(\phi, U),\\ H &:= H_{h,n}(\phi, U),\\ M' &:= M_{h,n}(\phi, U^c),\\ G' &:= G_{h,n}(\phi, U^c).\end{aligned} \tag{45}$$

Let ϕ' be an independent copy of ϕ, and define

$$\tau(x) := \begin{cases} \phi'(x) & \text{if } x \in U, \\ \phi(x) & \text{if } x \in U^c. \end{cases}$$

Note that τ has the same distribution as ϕ, and is independent of $(\phi(x))_{x\in U}$.

Let $K_0 = K_0(\epsilon, n, U, E, m)$ be the event

$$\begin{aligned}\{|M_{h,n}(\phi) - m_0| \le \epsilon,\ |H_{h,n}(\phi) - E_0| \le \epsilon,\ |M' - m| \le \epsilon,& \\ |G' - E| \le \epsilon,\ U \in \mathcal{U}(\phi, \epsilon)\}.&\end{aligned}$$

Note that it is possible for K_0 to happen only if $m \le M' + \epsilon \le M_{h,n}(\phi) + \epsilon \le m_0 + 2\epsilon \le C$ and $E \le G' + \epsilon \le CM' + \epsilon \le C$. Therefore we will assume these upper bounds on E and m in what follows. We will also assume that

$$|U| \le \frac{4^d(m_0+\epsilon)}{h^d\epsilon^{d+2}}, \tag{46}$$

since without this condition, the event K_0 is impossible. Let K_1 be the event

$$K_1 := \left\{M_{h,n}(\tau, U) \le \frac{2|U|}{n^d}\right\}.$$

Since $M + M' = M_{h,n}(\phi)$, therefore if K_0 happens, then

$$|M - (m_0 - m)| \le |M + M' - m_0| + |M' - m| \le 2\epsilon. \tag{47}$$

Again, if $K_0 \cap K_1$ happens, then

$$\begin{aligned}|M_{h,n}(\tau) - m| &\le |M' - m| + M_{h,n}(\tau, U) \\ &\le \epsilon + \frac{2|U|}{n^d} \\ &\le \epsilon + C\epsilon^{-(d+2)}n^{-d} =: \epsilon_1, \qquad (48)\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}|G_{h,n}(\tau) - E| &\le |G' - E| + G_{h,n}(\tau, U) + \frac{h^{d-2}}{2}\sum_{\substack{x\in U,\ y\in U^c \\ x\sim y}} |\tau_x - \tau_y|^2 \\ &\le \epsilon + C\sum_{x\in U}|\tau_x|^2 + C\sum_{x\in\partial U^c}|\phi_x|^2 \\ &\le C\epsilon + C\epsilon^{-(d+2)}n^{-d} =: \epsilon_2. \qquad (49)\end{aligned}$$

Let

$$\begin{aligned}p_1 &:= \mathbb{P}(|M - (m_0 - m)| \le 2\epsilon), \\ p_2 &:= \mathbb{P}(|M_{h,n}(\tau) - m| \le \epsilon_1,\ |G_{h,n}(\tau) - E| \le \epsilon_2).\end{aligned}$$

Note that K_0 and K_1 are independent events, and there is a positive universal constant C_0 such that $\mathbb{P}(K_1) \ge 1/C_0$. Thus, by (47), (48), (49) and the independence of M and τ,

$$\mathbb{P}(K_0) \le C_0\mathbb{P}(K_0)\mathbb{P}(K_1) = C_0\mathbb{P}(K_0 \cap K_1) \le C_0 p_1 p_2. \tag{50}$$

Define

$$\xi(x) := \frac{\tau(x)}{\left(\sum_{y\in V_n} |\tau(y)|^2\right)^{1/2}}.$$

Then ξ is uniformly distributed on the unit sphere of $\mathbb{C}^{V_n}$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
2h^{2-d}G_{h,n}(\xi) = \sum_{\substack{x,y\in V_n\\ x\sim y}} |\xi(x)-\xi(y)|^2 &= \frac{h^d}{M_{h,n}(\tau)} \sum_{\substack{x,y\in V_n\\ x\sim y}} |\tau(x)-\tau(y)|^2 \\
&= \frac{2h^2 G_{h,n}(\tau)}{M_{h,n}(\tau)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, if $|M_{h,n}(\tau)-m|\le \epsilon_1$ and $|G_{h,n}(\tau)-E|\le\epsilon_2$, then (since $m\le C$ and $E\le C$, as observed before),

$$\begin{aligned}
\left|2h^{2-d}G_{h,n}(\xi) - \frac{2h^2E}{m}\right| &= 2h^2\left|\frac{G_{h,n}(\tau)}{M_{h,n}(\tau)} - \frac{E}{m}\right| \\
&\le \frac{C\epsilon_1 + C\epsilon_2}{(m-\epsilon_1)m} =: \epsilon_3,
\end{aligned}$$

provided that $m > \epsilon_1$. If $m\le\epsilon_1$, define $\epsilon_3=\infty$. Now, it is a simple probabilistic fact that ξ and $M_{h,n}(\tau)$ are independent. Hence $p_2\le p_3p_4$, where

$$\begin{aligned}
p_3 &:= \mathbb{P}(|M_{h,n}(\tau)-m|\le\epsilon_1),\\
p_4 &:= \mathbb{P}\left(\left|2h^{2-d}G_{h,n}(\xi) - \frac{2h^2E}{m}\right| \le \epsilon_3\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, from (50) we have

$$\mathbb{P}(K_0) \le C_0 p_1 p_3 p_4. \tag{51}$$

Our next task is to get upper bounds for p_1, p_3 and p_4. To bound p_1, we consider two cases. First, if $m_0-m>2\epsilon$, then we apply (43) from Lemma 18 (with $k\le C(\epsilon)$, $x=n^d(m_0-m)$ and $y=n^d\epsilon$) to get

$$\frac{\log p_1}{n^d} = -(m_0-m)+\epsilon+o(1),$$

where recall that the notation $o(1)$ stands for a quantity depending only on ϵ, E, m, L, n and the fixed parameters, that goes to zero as $n\to\infty$ with all else fixed. In particular, $o(1)$ does not depend on our choice of U.

Next, if $m_0-m\le 2\epsilon$, apply (44) from Lemma 18 (with $k\le C(\epsilon)$ and $x=3n^d\epsilon$) to get

$$\frac{\log p_1}{n^d} = o(1).$$

Combining the two cases, we get

$$\frac{\log p_1}{n^d} \le -(m_0-m)+3\epsilon+o(1). \tag{52}$$

We deal with p_3 similarly. If $m \ge 2\epsilon^{1/4}$, we apply (43) with $k = n^d$, $x = n^d m$ and $y = n^d \epsilon_1$ to get

$$\frac{\log p_3}{n^d} = 1 + \log m - m + C\epsilon^{3/4} + o(1). \tag{53}$$

When $m < 2\epsilon^{1/4}$, we apply (44) with $k = n^d$ and $x = 6n^d\epsilon$ to get

$$\frac{\log p_3}{n^d} \le 1 + C\log\epsilon + o(1). \tag{54}$$

Again, if $m \ge 2\epsilon^{1/4}$, then $\epsilon_3 \le C\epsilon^{1/2} + o(1)$. Therefore by Theorem 15 we have that if $m \ge 2\epsilon^{1/4}$, then

$$\frac{\log p_4}{n^d} \le -\Psi_{d, C\epsilon^{1/2}}\biggl(\frac{2h^2 E}{m}\biggr) + o(1).$$

By Lemma 19, this gives

$$\frac{\log p_4}{n^d} \le \max\biggl\{-\Psi_d\biggl(\frac{2h^2 E}{m}\biggr),\ -L\biggr\} + a(\epsilon, L) + o(1), \tag{55}$$

where recall that $a(\epsilon, L)$ stands for a quantity that depends only on ϵ, L and the fixed parameters, that goes to zero as $\epsilon \to 0$ for any fixed L. In particular, $a(\epsilon, L)$ does not depend on E, m, n or U.

Combining (51), (52), (53) and (55) and the observation that $m \le C$, we see that when $m \ge 2\epsilon^{1/4}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\log \mathbb{P}(K_0)}{n^d} &\le \frac{\log p_1 + \log p_3 + \log p_4}{n^d}\\ &\le 1 - m_0 + \log m\\ &\qquad + \max\biggl\{-\Psi_d\biggl(\frac{2h^2E}{m}\biggr),\ -L\biggr\} + a(\epsilon, L) + o(1)\\ &\le \max\{1 - m_0 + \Theta(E, m, h),\ C - L\} + a(\epsilon, L) + o(1).\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, since

$$C\log\epsilon \le -L + a(\epsilon, L),$$

and $\log p_4 \le 0$ and $m \le C$, it follows from (51), (52) and (54) that when $m < 2\epsilon^{1/4}$,

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\log \mathbb{P}(K_0)}{n^d} &\le \frac{\log p_1 + \log p_3}{n^d}\\ &\le C - L + a(\epsilon, L) + o(1).\end{aligned}$$

Combining the last two displays, we see that for all $\epsilon \in (0,1)$, $n \ge 1$, $E \ge 0$, $m \ge 0$ and U satisfying (46), we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{\log \mathbb{P}(K_0(\epsilon, n, U, E, m))}{n^d}\\ &\le \max\{1 - m_0 + \Theta(E, m, h),\ C - L\} + a(\epsilon, L) + o(1).\end{aligned}$$

Now note that K can be written simply as

$$K = \bigcup_{\substack{U \subseteq V_n \\ |U| \le \frac{4^d(m_0+2\epsilon)}{h^d \epsilon^{d+2}}}} K_0(\epsilon, n, U, E, m).$$

Since there are at most $e^{C(\epsilon)\log n}$ terms in the above union, this completes the proof of the lemma. □

Lemma 22. *Fix n and let $K = K(\epsilon, n, E, m)$ be the event defined in Lemma 21. If K happens, then there exists a function η on V_n such that*

(a) $\|\phi - \eta\|_\infty \le \epsilon$,
(b) $|(E_0 - E) - H_{h,n}(\eta)| \le 2\epsilon$, *and*
(c) $|(m_0 - m) - M_{h,n}(\eta)| \le C\epsilon + C\epsilon^{p-1}$.

Proof. Suppose that K has happened. Choose any $U \in \mathcal{U}(\phi, \epsilon)$ satisfying the conditions of K and let M, H, M' and G' be as in (45). Let η be the (random) function

$$\eta(x) := \begin{cases} \phi(x) & \text{if } x \in U, \\ 0 & \text{if } x \in U^c. \end{cases} \tag{56}$$

Then

$$\|\phi - \eta\|_\infty = \max_{x \in U^c} |\phi(x)| \le \epsilon.$$

Next, note that

$$\begin{aligned} |M_{h,n}(\eta) - (m_0 - m)| &= |M - (m_0 - m)| \\ &= |M_{h,n}(\phi) - M' - (m_0 - m)| \le 2\epsilon, \end{aligned} \tag{57}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} |H_{h,n}(\eta) - (E_0 - E)| &\le |H_{h,n}(\phi) - E_0| + |G' - E| \\ &\quad + |H_{h,n}(\phi) - G' - H_{h,n}(\eta)| \\ &\le 2\epsilon + C \sum_{x \in \partial U \cup \partial U^c} |\phi(x)|^2 + C \sum_{x \in U^c} |\phi(x)|^{p+1} \\ &\le C\epsilon + C\epsilon^{p-1}. \end{aligned} \tag{58}$$

This completes the proof. □

Lemma 23. *Let $K(\epsilon, n, E, m)$ be as in Lemma 21. Given any $m_1 > 0$ and $E_1 > 0$, there exists $C_0 = C_0(E_1, m_1)$ and C_1 such that if $m \ge m_1$, $E \ge E_1$, $\epsilon \le C_0$ and (E, m) is at ℓ^∞ distance greater than $C_1\epsilon + C_1\epsilon^{p-1}$ from the set $\mathcal{R}(E_0, m_0, h)$, then for all $n \ge C_2(E_1, m_1, \epsilon)$, the event $K(\epsilon, n, E, m)$ is impossible.*

Proof. If $K(\epsilon, n, E, m)$ happens, then by Lemma 22, there exists a function $\eta \in \mathbb{C}^{V_n}$ such that

$$|(m_0 - m) - M_{h,n}(\eta)| \le 2\epsilon, \tag{59}$$

$$|(E_0 - E) - H_{h,n}(\eta)| \le C\epsilon + C\epsilon^{p-1}. \tag{60}$$

Let $E' := E_0 - H_{h,n}(\eta)$ and $m' := m_0 - M_{h,n}(\eta)$. Then the above inequalities may be rewritten as

$$|m - m'| \le 2\epsilon, \quad |E - E'| \le C\epsilon + C\epsilon^{p-1}. \tag{61}$$

Now, if $m \ge m_1$ and if ϵ is small enough depending only on m_1 and the fixed parameters, then by (59),

$$m' = m_0 - M_{h,n}(\eta) \ge m - 2\epsilon \ge m_1 - 2\epsilon \ge 0. \tag{62}$$

But by definition, $m' \le m_0$. Therefore, $m' \in [0, m_0]$. Next, note that

$$E_{\min}(M_{h,n}(\eta), h, n) \le H_{h,n}(\eta) \le E_{\max}(M_{h,n}(\eta), h, n),$$

which is the same as

$$E_0 - E_{\max}(m_0 - m', h, n) \le E' \le E_0 - E_{\min}(m_0 - m', h, n).$$

Again, if $E \ge E_1$, then for sufficiently small ϵ (depending only on m_1 and the fixed parameters), (60) implies that

$$E' = E_0 - H_{h,n}(\eta) \ge E_1 - C\epsilon - C\epsilon^{p-1} \ge 0. \tag{63}$$

Combining the last two displays, we see that if $E \ge E_1$, $m \ge m_1$ and ϵ is sufficiently small, then

$$\begin{aligned} &\max\{E_0 - E_{\max}(m_0 - m', h, n), 0\} \\ &\le E' \le E_0 - E_{\min}(m_0 - m', h, n). \end{aligned} \tag{64}$$

By Lemma 9 and the characterization (41) of the set $\mathcal{R}(E_0, m_0, h)$ from Section 10, the equations (62), (63) and (64) show that if $\epsilon \le C_0(E_1, m_1)$ and $n \ge C_2(E_1, m_1, \epsilon)$, then the event $K(\epsilon, n, E, m)$ implies that the point (E', m') is within distance ϵ from the set $\mathcal{R}(E_0, m_0, h)$. By (61), the proof is done. □

Lemma 24. *For any $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ and any closed set $A \subseteq [0, \infty)^2$, let $F = F(\epsilon, n, A)$ be the event*

$$\begin{aligned} \{&|M_{h,n}(\phi) - m_0| \le \epsilon,\ |H_{h,n}(\phi) - E_0| \le \epsilon, \text{ and for some } U \in \mathcal{U}(\phi, \epsilon), \\ &(G_{h,n}(\phi, U^c), M_{h,n}(\phi, U^c)) \in A\}. \end{aligned}$$

Then for any such set A,

$$\limsup_{\epsilon \to 0} \limsup_{n \to \infty} \frac{\log \mathbb{P}(F(\epsilon, n, A))}{n^d} \le 1 - m_0 + \widehat{\Theta}(E_0, m_0, h, A),$$

where

$$\widehat{\Theta}(E_0, m_0, h, A) := \sup_{(E,m) \in A \cap \mathcal{R}(E_0, m_0, h)} \Theta(E, m, h).$$

Proof. If $F(\epsilon, n, A)$ happens, then $M_{h,n}(\phi, U^c)$ and $G_{h,n}(\phi, U^c)$ are bounded by constants depending only on the fixed parameters. Also, $\mathcal{R}(E_0, m_0, h)$ is a bounded set. Hence we can assume without loss of generality that A is contained in some bounded region determined by the fixed parameters.

Then A is compact, and therefore there is a minimal collection $\mathcal{C}(\epsilon)$ of points in A such that the union of ℓ^∞-balls of radius ϵ around these points covers A, and the size of this collection is bounded by a constant depending only on ϵ and the fixed parameters. Then we have

$$F(\epsilon, n, A) \subseteq \bigcup_{(E,m)\in\mathcal{C}(\epsilon)} K(\epsilon, n, E, m),$$

and therefore

$$\frac{\log \mathbb{P}(F(\epsilon, n, A))}{n^d} \le \frac{\log |\mathcal{C}(\epsilon)|}{n^d} + \max_{(E,m)\in\mathcal{C}(\epsilon)} \frac{\log \mathbb{P}(K(\epsilon, n, E, m))}{n^d}. \tag{65}$$

Fix $L > 0$. Fix $E_1 > 0$ and $m_1 > 0$ so small that whenever $E < E_1$ or $m < m_1$,

$$1 - m_0 + \Theta(E, m, h) \le -L. \tag{66}$$

(It is easy to see that this is possible, by first choosing m_1 so small that $1 - m_0 + \log m_1 \le -L$, and then choosing E_1 depending on m_1.) Let $C_0 = C_0(E_1, m_1)$ be the constant from Lemma 23, and assume that $\epsilon \le C_0$. Let C_1 be the second constant from Lemma 23. Let $\mathcal{C}'(\epsilon)$ be the set of points $(E, m) \in \mathcal{C}(\epsilon)$ that are at ℓ^∞ distance $\le C_1\epsilon + C_1\epsilon^{p-1}$ from the set $\mathcal{R}(E_0, m_0, h)$, and satisfy $E \ge E_1$ and $m \ge m_1$. Let $\mathcal{C}''(\epsilon)$ be the set of points in $(E, m) \in \mathcal{C}(\epsilon)$ such that $E < E_1$ or $m < m_1$. Let $\mathcal{C}'''(\epsilon)$ be the set of all remaining points in $\mathcal{C}(\epsilon)$. Then by Lemma 23, for each $(E, m) \in \mathcal{C}'''(\epsilon)$,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{\log \mathbb{P}(K(\epsilon, n, E, m))}{n^d} = -\infty.$$

For any $(E, m) \in \mathcal{C}''(\epsilon)$, Lemma 21 and the inequality (66) imply that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{\log \mathbb{P}(K(\epsilon, n, E, m))}{n^d} \\
&\le \max\{1 - m_0 + \max_{(E,m)\in\mathcal{C}''(\epsilon)} \Theta(E, m, h),\ C - L\} + a(\epsilon, L) \\
&\le C - L + a(\epsilon, L),
\end{aligned}$$

where $a(\epsilon, L)$ is a quantity depending only on ϵ, L and the fixed parameters, such that for each fixed $L > 0$, $\lim_{\epsilon\to 0} a(\epsilon, L) = 0$.

Finally, again by Lemma 21, for any $(E, m) \in \mathcal{C}'(\epsilon)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{\log \mathbb{P}(K(\epsilon, n, E, m))}{n^d} \\
&\le \max\{1 - m_0 + \max_{(E,m)\in\mathcal{C}'(\epsilon)} \Theta(E, m, h),\ C - L\} + a(\epsilon, L).
\end{aligned}$$

Combining the last three displays with (65), we get

$$\begin{aligned}&\limsup_{n\to\infty}\frac{\log\mathbb{P}(F(\epsilon,n,A))}{n^d}\\&\le\max\{1-m_0+\max_{(E,m)\in\mathcal{C}'(\epsilon)}\Theta(E,m,h),\ C-L\}+a(\epsilon,L).\end{aligned}$$

Now, by the definition of $\mathcal{C}'(\epsilon)$ and the continuity of Θ, it follows easily that

$$\limsup_{\epsilon\to 0}\max_{(E,m)\in\mathcal{C}'(\epsilon)}\Theta(E,m,h)\le\widehat{\Theta}(E,m,h,A).$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}&\limsup_{\epsilon\to 0}\limsup_{n\to\infty}\frac{\log\mathbb{P}(F(\epsilon,n,A))}{n^d}\\&\le\max\{1-m_0+\widehat{\Theta}(E,m,h,A),\ C-L\}.\end{aligned}$$

Since L was arbitrary, this completes the proof. □

Lemma 25. *Take any* $\epsilon,\delta\in(0,1)$. *Let* A_δ *be the set*

$$\begin{aligned}\{(E,m)\in[0,\infty)^2 : \max\{|E-E^*|,|m-m^*|\}\ge\delta/2\\ \text{for all } (E^*,m^*)\in\mathcal{M}(E_0,m_0,h)\}.\end{aligned}$$

If ϵ *is sufficiently small depending only on* δ *and the fixed parameters, then for any* n, $B(\epsilon,\delta,n)\implies F(\epsilon,n,A_\delta)$.

Proof. Suppose that $B(\epsilon,\delta,n)$ has happened. Recall that $\mathcal{U}(\phi,\epsilon)$ is always non-empty by Lemma 20; choose any $U\in\mathcal{U}(\phi,\epsilon)$. Let $E:=G_{h,n}(\phi,U^c)$ and $m:=M_{h,n}(\phi,U)$. Suppose that $|E-E^*|<\delta/2$ and $|m-m^*|<\delta/2$ for some $(E^*,m^*)\in\mathcal{M}(E_0,m_0,h)$. We prove that this is impossible by arriving at a contradiction.

In the situation described above, the event $K(\epsilon,n,E,m)$ has happened. Thus, there is a function η satisfying the conditions (a), (b) and (c) of Lemma 22. Consequently, we have

(a1) $\|\phi-\eta\|_\infty\le\epsilon$,
(b1) $|(E_0-E^*)-H_{h,n}(\eta)|\le 2\epsilon+\delta/2$, and
(c1) $|(m_0-m^*)-M_{h,n}(\eta)|\le C\epsilon+C\epsilon^{p-1}+\delta/2$.

If ϵ is sufficiently small depending only on δ and the fixed parameters, then this shows that ϕ is a δ-soliton, giving the desired contradiction. □

Proof of Theorem 17. Fix $\delta\in(0,1)$. Choose $\epsilon\in(0,1)$ small enough to satisfy the criterion of Lemma 25. Then for all n,

$$\mathbb{P}(B(\epsilon,\delta,n))\le\mathbb{P}(F(\epsilon,n,A_\delta)).$$

By the continuity of Θ and the fact that A_δ is a closed set not intersecting the region where Θ attains its maximum in $\mathcal{R}(E_0,m_0,h)$, it follows that

$$\widehat{\Theta}(E_0,m_0,h,A_\delta)<\widehat{\Theta}(E_0,m_0,h).$$

Lemma 24 now completes the proof. □

12. Exponential decay of solitons

Fix n. Suppose that $q \in \mathbb{C}^{V_n}$ is a ground state soliton, that is, it minimizes energy among all functions with a given mass. Then by standard Euler-Lagrange theory, q satisfies

$$-\omega q = -\Delta q - |q|^{p-1} q,$$

for some real number ω. This can be rewritten as

$$(2dh^{-2} + \omega) q(x) - h^{-2} \sum_{y \,:\, y \sim x} q(y) = |q(x)|^{p-1} q(x) \ \text{ for all } x \in V_n. \tag{67}$$

Let $m := M_{h,n}(q)$. The following theorem shows that q must be exponentially decaying outside a small set.

Theorem 26. *There exists a subset U of V_n, whose size can be bounded by a number depending only on m, h, p and d, such that for all $x \in V_n$,*

$$|q(x)| \le A e^{-bD_U(x)},$$

where $D_U(x)$ is the ℓ^1 distance of x from U, that is, the minimum of $|y - x|_1$ over all $y \in U$, and A, b are positive constants depending only on m, h, p and d. Here $y - x$ means the difference of y and x modulo n in each coordinate.

The proof of Theorem 26 follows closely the outline of the proof of exponential decay in the continuum case, as given in [62, Proposition B.7]. The main difference is that in the discrete case, we have to deal with discrete Green's functions. The proof is divided into several lemmas.

Lemma 27. *If $p < 1 + 4/d$, then for any $m > 0$, $h > 0$ and $n \ge C(p, d, h, m)$,*

$$\omega > -\frac{E_{\min}(m, h)}{m} > 0.$$

Proof. Multiplying both sides of (67) by $\overline{q(x)}$ and summing over $x \in V_n$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\omega \sum_{x \in V_n} |q(x)|^2 &= -2dh^{-2} \sum_{x \in V_n} |q(x)|^2 + h^{-2} \sum_{\substack{x, y \in V_n \\ x \sim y}} \big(\overline{q(x)} q(y) + q(x) \overline{q(y)}\big) \\
&\qquad + \sum_{x \in V_n} |q(x)|^{p+1} \\
&= -h^{-2} \sum_{\substack{x, y \in V_n \\ x \sim y}} |q(x) - q(y)|^2 + \sum_{x \in V_n} |q(x)|^{p+1} \\
&\ge -h^{-2} \sum_{\substack{x, y \in V_n \\ x \sim y}} |q(x) - q(y)|^2 + \frac{2}{p+1} \sum_{x \in V_n} |q(x)|^{p+1} \\
&= -2h^{-d} E_{\min}(m, h, n).
\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 9, $E_{\min}(m, h, n) \to E_{\min}(m, h)$ as $n \to \infty$ and by Lemma 11, $E_{\min}(m, h) < 0$. This completes the proof. $\square$

Lemma 28. *Let $r := 2d/(2d+\omega h^2)$. Let $p(x,y,k)$ be the probability that a simple symmetric random walk on the torus V_n starting at x at step 0 is at y at step k. Then the soliton q satisfies for all $x \in V_n$ the identity*

$$q(x) = \frac{h^2}{2d}\sum_{y\in V_n}\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} r^{k+1} p(x,y,k)|q(y)|^{p-1}q(y).$$

Proof. Given q satisfying (67), let f be the function on the right-hand side in the above display. (Note that the series converges because $r < 1$, by Lemma 27.) Our goal is to show that $q = f$. First, note that

$$\sum_{z\,:\,z\sim x} f(z) = \frac{h^2}{2d}\sum_{y\in V_n}\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} r^{k+1}|q(y)|^{p-1}q(y)\biggl(\sum_{z\,:\,z\sim x} p(z,y,k)\biggr).$$

By the translation invariance of the torus, it is easy to see that

$$\sum_{z\,:\,z\sim x} p(z,y,k) = \sum_{w\,:\,w\sim y} p(x,w,k).$$

Again, note that the random walk can be at y at time $k+1$ if and only if it was at some neighbor of y at time k and moved to y at the $(k+1)$th step. Therefore,

$$p(x,y,k+1) = \frac{1}{2d}\sum_{w\,:\,w\sim y} p(x,w,k).$$

Combining the last three displays, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{z\,:\,z\sim x} f(z) &= h^2\sum_{y\in V_n}\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} r^{k+1} p(x,y,k+1)|q(y)|^{p-1}q(y)\\ &= \frac{h^2}{r}\sum_{y\in V_n}\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} r^{k+1} p(x,y,k)|q(y)|^{p-1}q(y)\\ &\qquad - h^2\sum_{y\in V_n} p(x,y,0)|q(y)|^{p-1}q(y)\\ &= (2d+\omega h^2)f(x) - h^2|q(x)|^{p-1}q(x).\end{aligned}$$

Comparing with (67), this shows that for all $x \in V_n$,

$$(2d+\omega h^2)(f(x)-q(x)) - \sum_{y\,:\,y\sim x}(f(y)-q(y)) = 0.$$

In other words, $(\omega I - \Delta)(f-q) = 0$, where I is the identity matrix in $\mathbb{C}^{V_n\times V_n}$. Since Δ is a negative semidefinite operator (Lemma 7) and $\omega > 0$ by Lemma 27, $\omega I - \Delta$ is non-singular. This shows that $q = f$ and completes the proof. $\square$

For any $\delta > 0$, let

$$U_\delta := \{x \in V_n : |q(x)| > \delta\}.$$

For $x \in V_n$, let $D_\delta(x)$ denote the ℓ^1 distance of x from U_δ, that is, the minimum of $|x-y|_1$ over all $y \in U_\delta$. Here, as usual the difference $x-y$ is computed modulo n in each coordinate.

Lemma 29. *For each $x \in V_n$ and $\delta > 0$,*

$$|q(x)| \le C_0 r^{D_\delta(x)} + \omega^{-1}\delta^{p-1} \sum_{y\in V_n} r^{|y-x|_1}|q(y)|,$$

where $C_0 = \omega^{-1} m^{p+1} h^{-d(p-1)}\delta^{-2}$ and $r = 2d/(2d+\omega h^2)$.

Proof. A random walk starting at x at time 0 cannot reach y before time $|y-x|_1$. Thus, $p(x,y,k) = 0$ for all $k < |y-x|_1$. By Lemma 28, this gives

$$\begin{aligned}|q(x)| &\le \frac{h^2}{2d}\sum_{y\in V_n}|q(y)|^p\biggl(\sum_{k=|x-y|_1}^{\infty} r^{k+1}\biggr)\\ &= \omega^{-1}\sum_{y\in V_n} r^{|x-y|_1}|q(y)|^p.\end{aligned}$$

Now, if $y \notin U_\delta$, then $|q(y)|^p \le \delta^{p-1}|q(y)|$. On the other hand, if $y \in U_\delta$, then $|y-x|_1 \ge D_\delta(x)$. But again, $|q(x)|^2 \le h^{-d}m$ for all x and

$$|U_\delta| \le \frac{h^d \sum_{x\in U_\delta}|q(x)|^2}{h^d\delta^2} \le \frac{m}{h^d\delta^2}.$$

Thus,

$$\sum_{y\in V_n} r^{|x-y|_1}|q(y)|^p \le \frac{m}{h^d\delta^2} r^{D_\delta(x)}(h^{-d}m)^p + \delta^{p-1}\sum_{y\notin U_\delta} r^{|y-x|_1}|q(y)|.$$

This completes the proof. ☐

Proof of Theorem 26. Define

$$B(x) := C_0 \max_{y\in V_n} r^{\frac{1}{2}|y-x|_1 + D_\delta(y)},$$

where C_0 is the constant from Lemma 29. Note that $B(x)$ is never zero, $B(x) \ge C_0 r^{D_\delta(x)}$ for all x, and for all x, y,

$$\begin{aligned}B(y) &= C_0 \max_{z\in V_n} r^{\frac{1}{2}|z-y|_1 + D_\delta(z)}\\ &\le C_0 \max_{z\in V_n} r^{\frac{1}{2}|z-x|_1 - \frac{1}{2}|y-x|_1 + D_\delta(z)}\\ &= r^{-\frac{1}{2}|y-x|_1} B(x).\end{aligned}$$

Let K be the smallest number such that $|q(x)| \le K B(x)$ for all $x \in V_n$. Since B is never zero on V_n and V_n is a finite set, K must be finite. By

Lemma 29, Lemma 27, and the above observations,

$$\begin{aligned}|q(x)| &\le C_0 r^{D_\delta(x)} + K\omega^{-1}\delta^{p-1}\sum_{y\in V_n} r^{|y-x|_1}B(y)\\ &\le B(x) + KB(x)\omega^{-1}\delta^{p-1}\sum_{y\in V_n} r^{\frac{1}{2}|y-x|_1}\\ &\le B(x) + KB(x)\delta^{p-1}C(p,d,h,m).\end{aligned}$$

If δ is chosen so small that $\delta^{p-1}C(p,d,h,m)\le 1/2$, then the above inequality implies that

$$K \le 1 + \frac{K}{2}.$$

In other words, $K\le 2$. Thus, with such a choice of δ,

$$|q(x)| \le 2C_0 \max_{y\in V_n} r^{\frac{1}{2}|y-x|_1 + D_\delta(y)}$$

for all $x \in V_n$. To complete the proof, note that for any y,

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{2}|y-x|_1 + D_\delta(y) &\ge \frac{1}{2}|y-x|_1 + \frac{D_\delta(y)}{2}\\ &\ge \frac{1}{2}|y-x|_1 + \frac{D_\delta(x) - |y-x|_1}{2} = \frac{D_\delta(x)}{2}.\end{aligned}$$

Thus, $|q(x)| \le 2C_0 r^{D_\delta(x)/2}$ for all $x\in V_n$. □

13. LOWER BOUND

Fix $h>0$, and some $E_0\in\mathbb{R}$ and $m_0>0$ such that

$$E_{\min}(m_0,h) < E_0 < \frac{dm_0}{h^2}. \tag{68}$$

Let (E^*,m^*) be a point in $\mathcal{M}(E_0,m_0,h)$. By Lemma 16, m^* is strictly positive. The numbers p, d, h, E_0, m_0, E^* and m^* will be fixed throughout this section and will be called the 'fixed parameters'. Any constant that depends only on the fixed parameters will be denoted simply by C, instead of $C(p,d,h,E_0,m_0,E^*,m^*)$. If the constant depends on additional parameters $a,b,\ldots$, then it will be denoted by $C(a,b,\ldots)$.

Recall the random function ϕ defined in Section 6 and the objects $\mathcal{M}$, $\mathcal{R}$, Θ and $\widehat{\Theta}$ defined in Section 10.

Theorem 30. *Assume the condition* (68). *For arbitrary* $\epsilon\in(0,1)$, *let* $B_0 = B_0(\epsilon,n)$ *be the event*

$$\{|H_{h,n}(\phi) - E_0|\le\epsilon,\ |M_{h,n}(\phi)-m_0|\le\epsilon\}.$$

Then

$$\liminf_{\epsilon\to 0}\liminf_{n\to\infty}\frac{\log \mathbb{P}(B_0(\epsilon,n))}{n^d} \ge 1 - m_0 + \widehat{\Theta}(E_0,m_0,h).$$

Fix n and let f^* be an element of $\mathbb{C}^{V_n}$ such that $M_{h,n}(f^*) = m_0 - m^*$ and $H_{h,n}(f^*) = E_{\min}(m_0 - m^*, h, n)$. Then f^* is a ground state soliton for the DNLS on V_n. Fix $\epsilon > 0$. Let U be a subset of V_n such that

$$M_{h,n}(f^*, U^c \cup \partial U) \le \epsilon^2, \tag{69}$$

where, as before, $U^c = V_n \backslash U$. By Theorem 26, there exists a U satisfying the above property such that $|U| \le C(\epsilon)$.

Let z be a point chosen uniformly at random from V_n. Let ϕ' be an independent copy of ϕ and define

$$\gamma(x) := \begin{cases} \phi'(x) & \text{if } x \in z + U, \\ \phi(x) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Here $z + U$ is the translate of U by z on the torus V_n; that is, the addition is modulo n in each coordinate.

Let U' be the set of all points that are either in U or adjacent to some point in U. In other words, $U' = U \cup \partial U^c$. Define the following events:

$$\begin{aligned}
A_1 &:= \{|M_{h,n}(\phi) - m^*| \le \epsilon^2\}, \\
A_2 &:= \biggl\{\biggl|\frac{2h^2 G_{h,n}(\phi)}{M_{h,n}(\phi)} - \frac{2h^2 E^*}{m^*}\biggr| \le \epsilon^2, \\
&\qquad\qquad \max_{x \in V_n} |\phi(x)|^2 \le n^{-d/2} \sum_{x \in V_n} |\phi(x)|^2\biggr\}, \\
A_3 &:= \{M_{h,n}(\phi, z + U') \le 4m^*(2d+1)n^{-d}|U|\}, \\
A_4 &:= \{|\phi'(x) - f^*(x - z)| \le n^{-2d} \text{ for all } x \in z + U\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, let $A = A(\epsilon, n) := A_1 \cap A_2 \cap A_3 \cap A_4$.

Lemma 31. *Let A and γ be defined as above. We claim that if A happens, then*

$$|M_{h,n}(\gamma) - m_0| \le 2\epsilon^2 + C(\epsilon)n^{-d} \tag{70}$$

and

$$|H_{h,n}(\gamma) - E_0| \le C\epsilon^2 + b(\epsilon, n), \tag{71}$$

where $b(\epsilon, n)$ is a number depending only on the fixed parameters, ϵ and n such that $\lim_{n\to\infty} b(\epsilon, n) = 0$.

Proof. Suppose that A has happened. To prove (70), note that

$$M_{h,n}(\gamma) = M_{h,n}(\phi, z + U^c) + M_{h,n}(\phi', z + U). \tag{72}$$

By A_1 and A_3,

$$\begin{aligned}
&|M_{h,n}(\phi, z+U^c) - m^*|\\
&\le |M_{h,n}(\phi) - m^*| + M_{h,n}(\phi, z+U)\\
&\le |M_{h,n}(\phi) - m^*| + M_{h,n}(\phi, z+U')\\
&\le \epsilon^2 + C(\epsilon)n^{-d}. \qquad (73)
\end{aligned}$$

Now if A_4 holds, then by the inequality

$$|a^r - b^r| \le r|a-b|\max\{a^{r-1}, b^{r-1}\} \le r|a-b|(a+|a-b|)^{r-1}$$

that holds for any $a, b > 0$ and $r > 1$, we see that for any $x \in U$ and any $r > 1$,

$$\big||f^*(x)|^r - |\phi'(z+x)|^r\big| \le C(r)n^{-2d}. \qquad (74)$$

Thus by A_4, (69), and the fact that $M_{h,n}(f^*) = m_0 - m^*$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&|M_{h,n}(\phi', z+U) - (m_0 - m^*)|\\
&\le |M_{h,n}(f^*, U) - (m_0 - m^*)| + C|U|n^{-2d}\\
&\le M_{h,n}(f^*, U^c) + C(\epsilon)n^{-2d}\\
&\le \epsilon^2 + C(\epsilon)n^{-2d}. \qquad (75)
\end{aligned}$$

Combining (72), (73) and (75) gives

$$|M_{h,n}(\gamma) - m_0| \le 2\epsilon^2 + C(\epsilon)n^{-d}.$$

This proves (70). Next, note that

$$\begin{aligned}
H_{h,n}(\gamma) &= H_{h,n}(\phi, z+U^c) + H_{h,n}(\phi', z+U)\\
&\quad + \frac{h^{d-2}}{2}\sum_{\substack{x\in z+U,\ y\in z+U^c\\ x\sim y}} |\phi'(x) - \phi(y)|^2 \qquad (76)
\end{aligned}$$

By (69), (74) and A_4,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{x\in z+\partial U} |\phi'(x)|^2 &\le \sum_{x\in\partial U} |f^*(x)|^2 + C(\epsilon)n^{-2d}\\
&\le C\epsilon^2 + C(\epsilon)n^{-2d}.
\end{aligned}$$

By A_3,

$$\sum_{x\in z+\partial U^c} |\phi(x)|^2 \le C(\epsilon)n^{-d}.$$

The last two displays imply that

$$\frac{h^{d-2}}{2}\sum_{\substack{x\in z+U,\ y\in z+U^c\\ x\sim y}} |\phi'(x) - \phi(y)|^2 \le C\epsilon^2 + C(\epsilon)n^{-d}. \qquad (77)$$

By A_4 and (74),

$$|H_{h,n}(\phi', z+U) - H_{h,n}(f^*, U)| \le C(\epsilon)n^{-2d}.$$

Again from (69), it follows easily that

$$|H_{h,n}(f^*, U) - H_{h,n}(f^*)| \le C\epsilon^2.$$

From the last two displays, we have

$$|H_{h,n}(\phi', z+U) - H_{h,n}(f^*)| \le C\epsilon^2 + C(\epsilon)n^{-2d}. \tag{78}$$

Next, note that

$$H_{h,n}(\phi, z+U^c) = G_{h,n}(\phi, z+U^c) - N_{h,n}(\phi, z+U^c).$$

By A_3,

$$|G_{h,n}(\phi, z+U^c) - G_{h,n}(\phi)| \le CM_{h,n}(\phi, z+U') \le C(\epsilon)n^{-d}.$$

Again by A_1 and A_2 and the fact that $m^* > 0$, it follows that if ϵ is sufficiently small (depending only on the fixed parameters), then

$$|G_{h,n}(\phi) - E^*| \le C\epsilon^2.$$

Lastly, note that by A_2,

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{x\in z+U^c} |\phi(x)|^{p+1} &\le (\max_{x\in V_n} |\phi(x)|^{p-1}) \sum_{x\in V_n} |\phi(x)|^2 \\ &\le Cn^{-d(p-1)/2}.\end{aligned}$$

The last four displays combine to give

$$|H_{h,n}(\phi, z+U^c) - E^*| \le C\epsilon^2 + C(\epsilon)n^{-d} + Cn^{-d(p-1)/2}. \tag{79}$$

Combining (76), (77), (78) and (79) we get

$$|H_{h,n}(\gamma) - (H_{h,n}(f^*) + E^*)| \le C\epsilon^2 + C(\epsilon)n^{-d} + Cn^{-d(p-1)/2}.$$

By Lemma 9, $H_{h,n}(f^*) \to E_{\min}(m_0 - m^*, h)$ as $n \to \infty$. On the other hand by Lemma 16, $E_{\min}(m_0 - m^*, h) = E_0 - E^*$. This completes the proof. □

Lemma 32. *Let $A = A(\epsilon, n)$ be the event defined immediately before the statement of Lemma* 31*. Then*

$$\lim_{\epsilon\to 0}\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{\log \mathbb{P}(A(\epsilon, n))}{n^d} = 1 - m_0 + \widehat{\Theta}(E_0, m_0, h).$$

(Note that the definition of $A(\epsilon, n)$ involves our choice of f^*. The above result holds for any sequence of choices of f^* as $n \to \infty$.)

Proof. Let A_1, A_2, A_3 and A_4 be as in Lemma 31. Write

$$\mathbb{P}(A) = \mathbb{P}(A_1)\, \mathbb{P}(A_2 \mid A_1)\, \mathbb{P}(A_3 \mid A_1 \cap A_2)\mathbb{P}(A_4 \mid A_1 \cap A_2 \cap A_3).$$

For the first term, simply note that by Lemma 18,

$$\mathbb{P}(A_1) = \exp(n^d + n^d \log m^* - n^d m^* + n^d o(\epsilon, n)),$$

where $o(\epsilon, n)$ is a term depending only on ϵ, n and the fixed parameters such that

$$\limsup_{\epsilon\to 0}\limsup_{n\to\infty} |o(\epsilon, n)| = 0.$$

Next, define

$$\xi_x := \frac{\phi_x}{\left(\sum_{y\in V} |\phi_y|^2\right)^{1/2}}.$$

Then, as in the proof of Lemma 21, ξ is uniformly distributed on the unit sphere of $\mathbb{C}^{V_n}$, is independent of $M_{h,n}(\phi)$, satisfies

$$\frac{2h^2 G_{h,n}(\phi)}{M_{h,n}(\phi)} = \sum_{\substack{x,y\in V_n\\ x\sim y}} |\xi(x) - \xi(y)|^2$$

and

$$\frac{\max_{x\in V_n} |\phi(x)|^2}{\sum_{x\in V_n} |\phi(x)|^2} = \max_{x\in V_n} |\xi(x)|^2.$$

Consequently by Theorem 15 and Proposition 13,

$$\mathbb{P}(A_2 \mid A_1) = \mathbb{P}(A_2) = \exp\biggl(-n^d\Psi_d\biggl(\frac{2h^2E^*}{m^*}\biggr) + n^d o(\epsilon, n)\biggr).$$

Let z be as in the proof of Lemma 31. Note that since z is uniformly distributed on V_n and is independent of ϕ, and therefore by Markov's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}(A_3^c \mid \phi) &\le \frac{\mathbb{E}(M_{h,n}(\phi, z+U') \mid \phi)}{4m^*(2d+1)n^{-d}|U|}\\ &= \frac{|U'|M_{h,n}(\phi)}{n^d}\frac{n^d}{4m^*(2d+1)|U|} \le \frac{M_{h,n}(\phi)}{4m^*}.\end{aligned}$$

Thus, if A_1 happens and ϵ is sufficiently small (depending only on the fixed parameters), then $\mathbb{P}(A_3 \mid \phi) \ge 1/2$. Consequently,

$$1 \ge \mathbb{P}(A_3 \mid A_1 \cap A_2) \ge 1/2.$$

Lastly, note that since the coordinates of ϕ' are i.i.d. complex Gaussian with probability density function $(nh)^d\pi^{-1}\exp(-(nh)^d|x|^2)$, and are independent of z and ϕ, and $|U| \le C(\epsilon)$; therefore by (69),

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}(A_4 \mid \phi, z) = \mathbb{P}(A_4) &= \exp\biggl(-(nh)^d\sum_{x\in U}|f^*(x)|^2 + n^d o(\epsilon, n)\biggr)\\ &= \exp(-n^d(m_0 - m^*) + n^d o(\epsilon, n)).\end{aligned}$$

Consequently, the same is true for $\mathbb{P}(A_4 \mid A_1 \cap A_2 \cap A_3)$. Combining the above estimates finishes the proof. □

Proof of Theorem 30. By Lemma 31, if ϵ is sufficiently small (depending only on the fixed parameters) and n sufficiently large (depending only on ϵ and the fixed parameters), then the event $A(\epsilon, n)$ implies the event $B_0(\epsilon, n)$, but with ϕ replaced by γ. However, since γ has the same distribution as ϕ, by Lemma 32 this completes the proof of Theorem 30. $\square$

14. The radiating case

Fix $h > 0$, and some $E_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ and $m_0 > 0$ such that

$$\frac{dm_0}{h^2} \le E_0 < \frac{2dm_0}{h^2}.$$

As in Section 11, the numbers p, d, h, E_0 and m_0 will be fixed throughout this section and will be called the 'fixed parameters'. Any constant that depends only on the fixed parameters will be denoted simply by C, instead of $C(p, d, h, E_0, m_0)$. If the constant depends on additional parameters $a, b, \ldots$, then it will be denoted by $C(a, b, \ldots)$.

Recall the random function ϕ defined in Section 6.

Theorem 33. *Fix $\epsilon \in (0,1)$ and $\delta \in (0,1)$. Let A_0 be the event*

$$\{|M_{h,n}(\phi) - m_0| \le \epsilon,\ |H_{h,n}(\phi) - E_0| \le \epsilon\}.$$

Then for any fixed $\delta \in (0,1)$,

$$\limsup_{\epsilon \to 0} \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{\log \mathbb{P}(\max_{x\in V_n} |\phi(x)| > \delta \mid A_0)}{n^d} < 0.$$

The rest of this section is devoted to the proof of this theorem. Define

$$\xi_x := \frac{\phi(x)}{\left(\sum_{y\in V_n} |\phi(y)|^2\right)^{1/2}}.$$

Then ξ is uniformly distributed on the unit sphere of $\mathbb{C}^{V_n}$. Let

$$\alpha_0 := \frac{2h^2 E_0}{m_0},$$

so that $\alpha_0 \in [2d, 4d)$. Define three events:

$$A_1 := \{|M_{h,n}(\phi) - m_0| \le \epsilon^2\}.$$

$$A_2 := \biggl\{\biggl|\sum_{\substack{x,y\in V_n\\ x\sim y}} |\xi(x) - \xi(y)|^2 - \alpha_0\biggr| \le \epsilon^2\biggr\}.$$

$$A_3 := \{\max_{x\in V_n} |\xi(x)|^2 \le n^{-d/2}\}.$$

Lemma 34. *If $\epsilon < C$ and $n > C(\epsilon)$, then $A_1 \cap A_2 \cap A_3 \implies A_0$.*

Proof. Note that

$$\biggl|\sum_{\substack{x,y\in V_n\\ x\sim y}} |\xi(x) - \xi(y)|^2 - \alpha_0\biggr| = 2h^2 \biggl|\frac{G_{h,n}(\phi)}{M_{h,n}(\phi)} - \frac{E_0}{m_0}\biggr|.$$

This shows that if $\epsilon < C$, then $A_1 \cap A_2$ implies that

$$|G_{h,n}(\phi) - E_0| \le \epsilon^{3/2}. \tag{80}$$

Now, $A_1 \cap A_3$ implies

$$\max_{x\in V_n} |\phi(x)|^2 \le n^{-d/2} \sum_{x\in V_n} |\phi(x)|^2 \le Cn^{-d/2}$$

and hence

$$\begin{aligned} N_{h,n}(\phi) &\le C\big(\max_{x\in V_n} |\phi(x)|^2\big)^{(p-1)/2} \sum_{x\in V_n} |\phi(x)|^2 \\ &\le Cn^{-d(p-1)/4}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore if $n > C(\epsilon)$, then $N_{h,n}(\phi) \le \epsilon^{3/2}$. Combining this with (80) completes the proof. ☐

Lemma 35.

$$\liminf_{\epsilon\to 0} \liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{\log \mathbb{P}(A_0)}{n^d} \ge 1 + \log m_0 - m_0 - \Psi_d(\alpha_0).$$

Proof. The random variable $M_{h,n}(\phi)$ and the random vector ξ are independent. Therefore by Lemma 34, for $\epsilon < C$ and $n > C(\epsilon)$,

$$\mathbb{P}(A_0) \ge \mathbb{P}(A_1 \cap A_2 \cap A_3) = \mathbb{P}(A_1)\mathbb{P}(A_2 \cap A_3). \tag{81}$$

By Theorem 15,

$$\lim_{\epsilon\to 0} \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{\log \mathbb{P}(A_2 \cap A_3)}{n^d} = -\Psi_d(\alpha_0). \tag{82}$$

By Lemma 18,

$$\lim_{\epsilon\to 0} \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{\log \mathbb{P}(A_1)}{n^d} = 1 + \log m_0 - m_0. \tag{83}$$

Combining (81), (82) and (83) proves the lemma. ☐

Proof of Theorem 33. Define an event A_4 as

$$A_4 := \{\max_{x\in V_n} |\phi(x)| \ge \delta\}.$$

We have to show that

$$\limsup_{\epsilon\to 0} \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{\log \mathbb{P}(A_0 \cap A_4) - \log \mathbb{P}(A_0)}{n^d} < 0.$$

If $|H_{h,n}(\phi) - E_0| \le \epsilon$ and $\max_{x\in V_n} |\phi(x)| \ge \delta$, then

$$\begin{aligned} G_{h,n}(\phi) &= H_{h,n}(\phi) + \frac{h^d}{p+1} \sum_{x\in V_n} |\phi(x)|^{p+1} \\ &\ge E_0 - \epsilon + C\delta^{p+1}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $A_0 \cap A_4$ implies

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{\substack{x,y\in V_n\\ x\sim y}} |\xi(x)-\xi(y)|^2 &= \frac{2h^2 G_{h,n}(\phi)}{M_{h,n}(\phi)}\\ &\geq \frac{2h^2(E_0-\epsilon+C\delta^{p+1})}{m_0+\epsilon}.\end{aligned}$$

Thus, there is a constant C_0 depending only on the fixed parameters such that if $\epsilon < C(\delta)$, then $A_0\cap A_4$ implies the event $A_1\cap A_5$, where

$$A_5 := \biggl\{\sum_{\substack{x,y\in V_n\\ x\sim y}} |\xi(x)-\xi(y)|^2 \geq \alpha_0 + C_0\delta^{p+1}\biggr\}.$$

Moreover, by the independence of $M_{h,n}(\phi)$ and ξ, the events A_1 and A_5 are independent. Therefore, if $\epsilon < C(\delta)$, then

$$\mathbb{P}(A_0\cap A_4) \leq \mathbb{P}(A_1\cap A_5) = \mathbb{P}(A_1)\mathbb{P}(A_5).$$

Theorem 14 shows that for any $\epsilon < C(\delta)$,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{\log \mathbb{P}(A_5)}{n^d} = -\Psi_d(\alpha_0 + C_0\delta^{p+1}),$$

and we already know the limit of $n^{-d}\log\mathbb{P}(A_1)$ from (83). Since Ψ_d is a strictly increasing function in the interval $[2d, 4d)$ by Proposition 13, a combination of the above inequality and Lemma 35 proves the theorem. ☐

15. Discrete concentration-compactness

Fix $h > 0$ and $m > 0$. Let f_n be a sequence of functions on $\mathbb{Z}^d$ such that $M_h(f_n) = m$ for all n and $H_h(f_n) \to E_{\min}(m,h)$ as $n\to\infty$. The following theorem is the main result of this section.

Theorem 36. *There is a subsequence n_k of natural numbers and a sequence of points $y_k \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ such that the sequence of functions g_k defined as*

$$g_k(x) := f_{n_k}(y_k + x)$$

converges to a limit function g in the L^q norm for every $q\in[2,\infty]$. The function g has mass m and energy $E_{\min}(m,h)$.

The proof of Theorem 36 uses the well-known concentration-compactness argument (see [47, Section 1.4] and references therein). The main new challenge in the discrete case is that the properties of $E_{\min}(m,h)$ are not as well-understood as those of $E_{\min}(m)$.

For each $x\in\mathbb{Z}^d$ and each positive integer R, let $B(x,R)$ denote the ℓ^1 ball of radius R around x in $\mathbb{Z}^d$. For any two positive integers n and R, define the 'concentration function'

$$\rho_n(R) := \sup_{x\in\mathbb{Z}^d} \sum_{y\in B(x,R)} h^d |f_n(x)|^2.$$

Note that $\rho_n(R)$ is a non-decreasing function of R for each n. Let

$$\mu := \lim_{R\to\infty} \liminf_{n\to\infty} \rho_n(R).$$

Clearly, there are sequences R_k and n_k increasing to infinity such that

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \rho_{n_k}(R_k) = \mu.$$

It is easy to fix R_k such that R_k is even for each k. Passing to a subsequence if necessary (using a diagonal argument), we may assume that

$$\rho(R) := \lim_{k\to\infty} \rho_{n_k}(R)$$

exists for each positive integer R.

Lemma 37. $\mu = \lim_{k\to\infty} \rho_{n_k}(R_k) = \lim_{k\to\infty} \rho_{n_k}(R_k/2) = \lim_{R\to\infty} \rho(R)$.

Proof. First observe that from the monotonicity of ρ_{n_k},

$$\limsup_{k\to\infty} \rho_{n_k}(R_k/2) \le \limsup_{k\to\infty} \rho_{n_k}(R_k) = \mu.$$

On the other hand, for each R,

$$\rho(R) = \liminf_{k\to\infty} \rho_{n_k}(R) \ge \liminf_{n\to\infty} \rho_n(R),$$

and thus

$$\lim_{R\to\infty} \rho(R) \ge \mu.$$

Lastly, for any R, we have $R_k/2 \ge R$ for all k large enough, and thus

$$\rho_{n_k}(R_k/2) \ge \rho_{n_k}(R).$$

Let $k \to \infty$ gives that for all R,

$$\liminf_{k\to\infty} \rho_{n_k}(R_k/2) \ge \liminf_{k\to\infty} \rho_{n_k}(R) = \rho(R).$$

Letting $R \to \infty$ completes the proof. □

Since the function ρ_n is bounded between 0 and m for every n, therefore $0 \le \mu \le m$.

Lemma 38. $\mu > 0$.

Proof. Suppose that $\mu = 0$. Let all notation be as in Lemma 37. Then from Lemma 37, $\lim_{R\to\infty} \rho(R) = 0$. But ρ is a non-decreasing, non-negative function. Therefore $\rho(R) = 0$ for every R. In particular $\rho(1) = 0$ and hence $\lim_{k\to\infty} \rho_{n_k}(1) = 0$. This implies that

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \sup_{x\in\mathbb{Z}^d} |f_{n_k}(x)| = 0,$$

and therefore

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{k\to\infty} (H_h(f_{n_k}) - G_h(f_{n_k})) &= \lim_{k\to\infty} \frac{h^d}{p+1} \sum_{x\in\mathbb{Z}^d} |f_{n_k}(x)|^{p+1} \\ &\le \lim_{k\to\infty} \bigl(\sup_{x\in\mathbb{Z}^d} |f_{n_k}(x)|\bigr)^{p-1} \frac{M_h(f_{n_k})}{p+1} = 0.\end{aligned}$$

In particular,

$$\liminf_{k\to\infty} H_h(f_{n_k}) \ge 0,$$

contradicting $\lim_{k\to\infty} H_h(f_{n_k}) = E_{\min}(m,h) < 0$ (Lemma 11). □

Lemma 39. *There is a sequence of points y_n in $\mathbb{Z}^d$ such that*

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} |f_n(y_n)| > 0.$$

Proof. Let all notation be as in Lemma 37. By Lemma 38,

$$0 < \mu = \lim_{R\to\infty} \liminf_{n\to\infty} \rho_n(R).$$

Thus, there is some R such that

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} \rho_n(R) > 0.$$

Fix such an R. Let $x_n(R)$ be a point such that

$$\rho_n(R) = \sum_{z\in B(x_n(R),R)} h^d |f_n(z)|^2.$$

(The existence of such a point follows easily from the assumption that $M_h(f^n) = m < \infty$.) Since R is fixed, this shows that

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{\sum_{z\in B(x_n(R),R)} |f_n(z)|^2}{|B(x_n(R),R)|} > 0.$$

But there exists a point $y_n \in B(x_n(R),R)$ such that

$$|f_n(y_n)|^2 \ge \frac{\sum_{z\in B(x_n(R),R)} |f_n(z)|^2}{|B(x_n(R),R)|}.$$

This completes the proof. □

Lemma 40. *If a and b are positive real numbers and $\alpha > 1$, then*

$$(a+b)^\alpha \ge a^\alpha + b^\alpha.$$

Moreover, for each $0 < c_1 < c_2$, there is a positive constant $C = C(c_1, c_2, \alpha)$ such that whenever $a, b \in [c_1, c_2]$,

$$(a+b)^\alpha \ge a^\alpha + b^\alpha - C.$$

Proof. The first inequality is a simple consequence of

$$\sup_{0<x<1} (x^\alpha + (1-x)^\alpha) = 1,$$

by putting $x = a/(a+b)$. The second assertion follows similarly. □

Lemma 41. *For any positive m, m',*

$$E_{\min}(m,h) + E_{\min}(m',h) > E_{\min}(m+m',h).$$

Proof. Let f_n and g_n be sequences of functions such that $M_h(f_n) = m$ and $M_h(g_n) = m'$ for all n, and

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} H_h(f_n) = E_{\min}(m, h), \quad \lim_{n\to\infty} H_h(g_n) = E_{\min}(m', h).$$

Since for any function f, $M_h(|f|) = M(f)$ and $H_h(|f|) \le H_h(f)$ by the triangle inequality, we may assume that the functions f_n and g_n are nonnegative real valued. By Lemma 39, there exist sequences of points y_n and z_n and a positive real number ϵ such that

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} f_n(y_n) > \epsilon, \quad \liminf_{n\to\infty} g_n(z_n) > \epsilon.$$

Define functions v_n as

$$v_n(x) := f_n(x + y_n) + \mathrm{i} g_n(x + z_n),$$

where $\mathrm{i} = \sqrt{-1}$. Since f_n and g_n are real valued, it is clear that $M_h(v_n) = m + m'$ and $G_h(v_n) = G_h(f_n) + G_h(g_n)$ for each n. Now note that since $p > 1$, Lemma 40 implies that for all x,

$$\begin{aligned}|v_n(x)|^{p+1} &= |f_n(x + y_n) + \mathrm{i} g_n(x + z_n)|^{p+1} \\ &= ((f_n(x + y_n))^2 + (g_n(x + z_n))^2)^{(p+1)/2} \\ &\ge |f_n(x + y_n)|^{p+1} + |g_n(x + z_n)|^{p+1}.\end{aligned}$$

If n is large enough, then $f_n(y_n) > \epsilon$ and $g_n(z_n) > \epsilon$. Since $M_h(f_n) = m$ and $M_h(g_n) = m'$ for each n, therefore the sequences $f_n(y_n)$ and $g_n(z_n)$ are also uniformly bounded above. Therefore by Lemma 40, there is a positive constant C such that for all n,

$$\begin{aligned}|v_n(0)|^{p+1} &= ((f_n(y_n))^2 + (g_n(z_n))^2)^{(p+1)/2} \\ &\ge |f_n(y_n)|^{p+1} + |g_n(z_n)|^{p+1} - C.\end{aligned}$$

Combining all of the above observations, it follows that

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} H_h(v_n) < \lim_{n\to\infty} (H_h(f_n) + H_h(g_n)).$$

Since $M_h(v_n) = m + m'$ for all n, this completes the proof of the lemma. □

Lemma 42. *$\mu = m$.*

Proof. By Lemma 38 we know that $\mu > 0$. We also know from definition that $0 \le \mu \le m$. So we only have to eliminate the case $0 < \mu < m$. Suppose that this is true. Let $x_n(R)$ be as in the proof of Lemma 39. Then we can write

$$f_{n_k} = u_k + v_k + w_k$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}u_k(x) &= f_{n_k}(x) 1_{\{|x - x_{n_k}(R_k/2)| \le R_k/2\}}, \\ v_k(x) &= f_{n_k}(x) 1_{\{|x - x_{n_k}(R_k/2)| > R_k\}}, \\ w_k(x) &= f_{n_k}(x) 1_{\{R_k/2 < |x - x_{n_k}(R_k/2)| \le R_k\}}.\end{aligned}$$

Then note that by Lemma 37,

$$\begin{aligned} M_h(w_k) &= \sum_{x\in B(x_{n_k}(R_k/2),R_k)} h^d|u_{n_k}(x)|^2 - \sum_{x\in B(x_{n_k}(R_k/2),R_k/2)} h^d|u_{n_k}(x)|^2 \\ &\le \rho_{n_k}(R_k) - \sum_{x\in B(x_{n_k}(R_k/2),R_k/2)} h^d|u_{n_k}(x)|^2 \\ &= \rho_{n_k}(R_k) - \rho_{n_k}(R_k/2) \to 0 \text{ as } k\to\infty. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 37 it also follows that

$$M_h(u_k) = \sum_{x\in B(x_{n_k}(R_k/2),R_k/2)} h^d|f_{n_k}(x)|^2 = \rho_{n_k}(R_k/2) \to \mu \text{ as } k\to\infty.$$

Thus, $\lim_{k\to\infty} M_h(v_k) = m-\mu$. From similar arguments using Lemma 37 it follows that

$$\lim_{k\to\infty}(H_h(f_{n_k}) - (H_h(u_k)+H_h(v_k))) = 0. \tag{84}$$

By the continuity of $E_{\min}$ (Lemma 9),

$$\liminf_{k\to\infty} H_h(u_k) \ge E_{\min}(\mu,h), \quad \liminf_{k\to\infty} H_h(v_k) \ge E_{\min}(m-\mu,h).$$

Therefore by (84),

$$\liminf_{k\to\infty} H_h(f_{n_k}) \ge E_{\min}(\mu,h) + E_{\min}(m-\mu,h).$$

By the initial assumption that $H_h(f_n)\to E_{\min}(m,h)$, this shows that

$$E_{\min}(m,h) \ge E_{\min}(\mu,h) + E_{\min}(m-\mu,h),$$

contradicting Lemma 41. □

Proof of Theorem 36. By Lemma 42, we know that

$$\lim_{R\to\infty}\liminf_{n\to\infty}\rho_n(R) = m.$$

Choose R_0 so large that

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty}\rho_n(R_0) > m/2.$$

Let $x_n(R)$ be as in the proof of Lemma 39. Then for all sufficiently large n,

$$\sum_{x\in B(x_n(R_0),R_0)} h^d|f_n(x)|^2 > m/2.$$

Fix $\epsilon\in(0,m/2)$. Let R_ϵ be so large that

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty}\rho_n(R_\epsilon) > m-\epsilon.$$

Then for all n sufficiently large,

$$\sum_{x\in B(x_n(R_\epsilon),R_\epsilon)} h^d|f_n(x)|^2 > m-\epsilon.$$

Since $m - \epsilon + m/2 > m$, and $M_h(f_n) = m$ for all n, therefore for sufficiently large n, the balls $B(x_n(R_0), R_0)$ and $B(x_n(R_\epsilon), R_\epsilon)$ cannot be disjoint. In particular,

$$|x_n(R_0) - x_n(R_\epsilon)|_1 \le R_0 + R_\epsilon,$$

and therefore,

$$B(x_n(R_\epsilon), R_\epsilon) \subseteq B(x_n(R_0), R_0 + 2R_\epsilon).$$

Thus, if we define

$$v_n(x) := f_n(x + x_n(R_0)),$$

then for every $\epsilon \in (0, m/2)$, there is a sufficiently large integer S_ϵ such that for all sufficiently large n,

$$\sum_{x\,:\,|x|_1 > S_\epsilon} h^d |v_n(x)|^2 \le \epsilon.$$

Thus, the sequence v_n is compact in $L^2(\mathbb{Z}^d)$ and therefore has a convergence subsequence v_{n_k}, which we call g_k. Let g denote the limit of g_k in L^2. Since the convergence is in L^2, it follows automatically that $M_h(g) = m$. Again, since the L^∞ norm of a function on $\mathbb{Z}^d$ is bounded above by its L^2 norm, it follows that $\|g_k - g\|_\infty$ also goes to zero. Therefore, since for any $q \in (2, \infty)$,

$$\sum_{x\in\mathbb{Z}^d} |g_k(x) - g(x)|^q \le (\sup_{x\in\mathbb{Z}^d} |g_k(x) - g(x)|)^{q-2} \sum_{x\in\mathbb{Z}^d} |g_k(x) - g(x)|^2$$

it follows that g_k converges to g in L^q for any $q \in (2, \infty)$. This implies, in particular, that $H_h(g_k) \to H_h(g)$. □

16. HARMONIC ANALYSIS ON THE LATTICE

In this section p will not denote the nonlinearity parameter in the NLS. Instead, it will typically play the role of the p in the L^p norm.

We define the L^p norm for functions on $\mathbb{Z}^d$ at grid size h as follows:

$$\|f\|_{p,h} := \left(h^d \sum_{x\in\mathbb{Z}^d} |f_x|^p\right)^{1/p} = h^{d/p}\|f\|_p.$$

It may seem strange to define a new norm by multiplying the standard L^p norm by a constant; the purpose of the definition is to ensure that the constants in the discrete analogs of classical inequalities (that we develop below) do not depend on the grid size h. Note also that $\|f\|_{p,h} = \|\tilde{f}\|_p$, where $\tilde{f}$ is the continuum image of f at grid size h.

Similar inequalities were developed by Ladyzhenskaya [31] in the context of the "finite-difference method". However, since I could not find in [31] exactly what I needed (in particular, some delicate analyses of discrete Green's functions and a discrete version of the Hardy-Littlewood-Sobolev inequality of fractional integration), I decided to go ahead with my own derivations.

The grid size h will be fixed throughout this section. We will assume that $h \in (0,1)$, to avoid complications arising out of large values of h, in which we are not interested since we eventually want to send h to zero.

16.1. **Convolutions.** We define the convolution of two functions f and g on $\mathbb{Z}^d$ at grid size h as

$$(f * g)(x) := h^d \sum_{y\in\mathbb{Z}^d} f(y)g(x-y).$$

Although the notation does not explicit include the grid size, it will be understood from the context.

16.2. **Young's inequality.** Below we state and prove the discrete analog of Young's inequality for convolutions, at grid size h. The proof is exactly the same as in the continuous case; the important thing is that the constant does not depend on the grid size.

Proposition 43. *Let f, g be complex-valued functions on $\mathbb{Z}^d$. Let $1 \le p, q, r \le \infty$ satisfy*

$$\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = \frac{1}{r} + 1.$$

Then for any $h > 0$,

$$\|f * g\|_{r,h} \le \|f\|_{p,h}\|g\|_{q,h}.$$

Proof. Let $\alpha = (r-p)/r$ and $\beta = (r-q)/r$, so that α and β both belong to the interval $[0,1]$. Let $p_1 = p/\alpha$ and $p_2 = q/\beta$, so that $p_1, p_2 \in [1,\infty]$. Note that

$$\frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2} + \frac{1}{r} = 1.$$

Let $u = f * g$. By Hölder's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}
|u(x)| &= h^d \biggl|\sum_{y\in\mathbb{Z}^d} f(x-y)g(y)\biggr| \\
&\le h^d \sum_{y\in\mathbb{Z}^d} |f(x-y)|^{1-\alpha}|g(y)|^{1-\beta}|f(x-y)|^{\alpha}|g(y)|^{\beta} \\
&\le h^d \biggl(\sum_{y\in\mathbb{Z}^d} |f(x-y)|^{(1-\alpha)r}|g(y)|^{(1-\beta)r}\biggr)^{1/r} \\
&\qquad \times \biggl(\sum_{y\in\mathbb{Z}^d} |f(x-y)|^{\alpha p_1}\biggr)^{1/p_1} \biggl(\sum_{y\in\mathbb{Z}^d} |g(y)|^{\beta p_2}\biggr)^{1/p_2} \\
&= \biggl(h^d \sum_{y\in\mathbb{Z}^d} |f(x-y)|^{(1-\alpha)r}|g(y)|^{(1-\beta)r}\biggr)^{1/r} \|f\|^{\alpha}_{\alpha p_1,h}\|g\|^{\beta}_{\beta p_2,h}.
\end{aligned}$$

Taking rth power and summing over x gives

$$\|u\|_r^r \le \|f\|^{(1-\alpha)r}_{(1-\alpha)r,h}\|g\|^{(1-\beta)r}_{(1-\beta)r,h}\|f\|^{\alpha r}_{\alpha p_1,h}\|g\|^{\beta r}_{\beta p_2,h}.$$

Since $(1-\alpha)r = \alpha p_1 = p$ and $(1-\beta)r = \beta p_2 = q$, this completes the proof. $\square$

16.3. **Fourier transform.** Take any $h>0$ and let $K = 1/h$. For a function $f : \mathbb{Z}^d \to \mathbb{C}$ with finite L^1 norm, we define the Fourier transform of f at grid size h as

$$\hat{f}(\xi) := h^d \sum_{x\in\mathbb{Z}^d} f(x) e^{\mathrm{i}\pi h x\cdot\xi},\ \xi \in [-K,K]^d,$$

where $\mathrm{i} = \sqrt{-1}$. Again, the notation does not explicitly include the grid size; it is to be understood from the context. It is easy to verify the inversion formula

$$f(x) = 2^{-d}\int_{[-K,K]^d} \hat{f}(\xi) e^{-\mathrm{i}\pi h x\cdot\xi}\, d\xi.$$

With the above definition, if $u = f * g$ (at grid size h), then

$$\hat{u}(\xi) = \hat{f}(\xi)\hat{g}(\xi),$$

provided that f and g are in $L^1\cap L^2$. Another easy fact is the Plancherel identity

$$\|f\|_{2,h} = 2^{-d}\int_{[-K,K]^d} |\hat{f}(\xi)|^2 d\xi. \tag{85}$$

16.4. **Littlewood-Paley decomposition.** Fix $h>0$ and let $K=1/h$, as in the preceding Subsection. Let $\gamma_0 : [-K,K]\to[0,1]$ be a smooth (i.e. C^∞) function that is 1 in $[-1,1]$ and 0 outside $(-2,2)$. Define $\gamma : [-K,K]^d \to [0,1]$ as

$$\gamma(\xi) := \prod_{i=1}^d \gamma_0(\xi_i).$$

Note that γ is simply $\hat{g}$, where $g : \mathbb{Z}^d\to\mathbb{C}$ is the function

$$\begin{aligned} g(x) &= 2^{-d}\int_{[-K,K]^d} \gamma(\xi) e^{-\mathrm{i}\pi h x\cdot\xi}\, d\xi \\ &= 2^{-d}\prod_{i=1}^d \int_{-2}^{2} \gamma_0(\xi_i) e^{-\mathrm{i}\pi h x_i\xi_i}\, d\xi_i = \prod_{i=1}^d \varphi(\pi h x_i), \end{aligned}$$

where $\varphi:\mathbb{R}\to\mathbb{C}$ is the function

$$\varphi(x) = \frac{1}{2}\int_{-2}^{2}\gamma_0(t)e^{-\mathrm{i}xt}\, dt. \tag{86}$$

For any $a\in(0,K]$, let $\gamma_a : [-K,K]^d\to[0,1]$ be the function $\gamma(\xi/a)$. A computation similar to the above shows that γ_a is the Fourier transform of g_a, where

$$g_a(x) = a^d\prod_{i=1}^d \varphi(a\pi h x_i).$$

Lemma 44. *For any $a \in (0, K]$ and any $p \in [1, \infty]$,*

$$C_1(p,d)a^{d(p-1)/p} \le \|g_a\|_{p,h} \le C_2(p,d)a^{d(p-1)/p},$$

where $C_1(p,d)$ and $C_2(p,d)$ are constants depending only on p and d.

Proof. Note that for any $p \in [1, \infty]$,

$$\|g_a\|_{p,h}^p = h^d a^{dp}\biggl(\sum_{x\in\mathbb{Z}} |\varphi(a\pi hx)|^p\biggr)^d.$$

From the formula (86), the properties of γ_0, and standard results about oscillatory integrals (see e.g. [58, Chapter VIII, Proposition 1]) it follows that $\varphi(x)$ decays faster than $|x|^{-\alpha}$ for any α as $|x| \to \infty$. Moreover, φ is a continuous function. Therefore, as $ah \to 0$,

$$a\pi h \sum_{x\in\mathbb{Z}} |\varphi(a\pi hx)|^p \to \int_{\mathbb{R}} |\varphi(u)|^p \, du \in (0, \infty).$$

This shows that

$$\frac{C_1(p)}{ah} \le \sum_{x\in\mathbb{Z}} |\varphi(a\pi hx)|^p \le \frac{C_2(p)}{ah},$$

which completes the proof. □

For each a, let $P_a f$ be the function whose Fourier transform is

$$(\gamma_a(\xi) - \gamma_{a/2}(\xi))\hat{f}(\xi).$$

In other words, $P_a f = (g_a - g_{a/2}) * f$. Now, for any nonzero $\xi \in [-K, K]^d$,

$$\sum_{j=0}^{\infty}(\gamma_{2^{-j}K}(\xi) - \gamma_{2^{-(j+1)}K}(\xi)) = 1,$$

which shows that for functions with suitable decay at infinity (e.g. functions with bounded support)

$$f = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} P_{2^{-j}K} f.$$

This is the discrete analog (at grid size h) of the classical Littlewood-Paley decompositions (see e.g. [62, Appendix A]).

Lemma 45. *For any $h > 0$, any $1 \le p \le q$, any $a \in (0, K]$, and any $f : \mathbb{Z}^d \to \mathbb{C}$,*

$$\|P_a f\|_{q,h} \le C(p,q,d)a^{\frac{d}{p}-\frac{d}{q}}\|f\|_{p,h}.$$

Proof. By Young's inequality (Lemma 43), for any $1 \le p \le q$ and any $a \in (0, K]$,

$$\|P_a f\|_{q,h} \le (\|g_a\|_{s,h} + \|g_{a/2}\|_{s,h})\|f\|_{p,h},$$

where

$$\frac{1}{s} = \frac{1}{q} + 1 - \frac{1}{p}.$$

The proof is now easily completed using Lemma 44. □

16.5. **Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality.** The goal of this subsection is the prove a version of the Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality for the lattice at grid size h. (For the well-known continuum version, see e.g. [62, Appendix A].) The result is stated as Proposition 48 below. To prepare for this, we first need some definitions and lemmas.

For $i = 1, \ldots, d$, let e_i denote the ith coordinate vector. Let ∇_i denote the discrete derivative operator in the ith coordinate direction, defined as

$$\nabla_i f(x) := \frac{f(x + e_i) - f(x)}{h}. \tag{87}$$

Note that $\nabla_i f$ is simply the convolution of f with δ_i, where δ_i is the function

$$\delta_i(x) = \begin{cases} -h^{-d-1} & \text{if } x = 0, \\ h^{-d-1} & \text{if } x = -e_i, \\ 0 & \text{for all other } x. \end{cases}$$

Lemma 46. *For any $\xi \in [-K, K]^d$,*

$$\sum_{i=1}^d |\widehat{\nabla_i f}(\xi)|^2 \ge C|\xi|^2 |\hat{f}(\xi)|^2,$$

where $|\xi|$ is the Euclidean norm of ξ and C is a positive universal constant.

Proof. A straightforward verification shows that

$$\widehat{\nabla_i f}(\xi) = \frac{e^{-\mathrm{i}\pi h \xi_i} - 1}{h} \hat{f}(\xi).$$

There is a positive constant C_0 such that for all $\theta \in [-\pi, \pi]$,

$$|1 - e^{-\mathrm{i}\theta}| \ge C_0 |\theta|.$$

Therefore, if $\xi_i \in [-K, K]$, then

$$|\widehat{\nabla_i f}(\xi)| \ge C|\xi_i||\hat{f}(\xi)|.$$

This completes the proof of the lemma. □

Lemma 47. *For any $a \in (0, K]$ and any $f \in L^2(\mathbb{Z}^d)$,*

$$\|P_a f\|_{2,h} \le C a^{-1} G_h(f),$$

where C is a universal constant.

Proof. If $|\xi| \le a/2$, then $|\xi_i| \le a/2$ for each i, and hence

$$\gamma_a(\xi) = \gamma(\xi/a) = 1 = \gamma(2\xi/a) = \gamma_{a/2}(\xi).$$

On the other hand, if $|\xi| > 2\sqrt{d}a$, then $|\xi_i| > 2a$ for some i, and therefore

$$\gamma_a(\xi) = \gamma(\xi/a) = 0 = \gamma(2\xi/a) = \gamma_{a/2}(\xi).$$

Combining these facts with Lemma 46, Lemma 45 and the Plancherel identity (85), we get

$$\begin{aligned}\|P_a f\|_{2,h}^2 &= \int_{[-K,K]^d} |\widehat{P_a f}(\xi)|^2 \, d\xi \\ &= \int_{[-K,K]^d} |(\gamma_a(\xi) - \gamma_{a/2}(\xi))\hat{f}(\xi)|^2 \, d\xi \\ &\le Ca^{-2} \int_{a/2\le|\xi|\le 2\sqrt{d}a} \sum_{i=1}^d |(\gamma_a(\xi) - \gamma_{a/2}(\xi))\widehat{\nabla_i f}(\xi)|^2 \, d\xi \\ &\le Ca^{-2} \sum_{i=1}^d \|P_a \nabla_i f\|_{2,h}^2 \le Ca^{-2} \sum_{i=1}^d \|\nabla_i f\|_{2,h}^2 = Ca^{-2} G_h(f).\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. □

The following proposition may be called the Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality for the lattice with grid size h. The important thing, as usual, is that the constant does not depend on h.

Proposition 48. *Take any* $2 < q \le \infty$ *and let* $\theta \in (0,1)$ *solve*

$$\frac{1}{q} = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{\theta}{d}. \tag{88}$$

Then for any $f \in L^q(\mathbb{Z}^d) \cap L^2(\mathbb{Z}^d)$, *we have*

$$\|f\|_{q,h} \le C(q,d)\|f\|_{2,h}^{1-\theta} G_h(f)^{\theta/2}.$$

Proof. Then for any f, by Lemma 45,

$$\begin{aligned}\|f\|_{q,h} &\le \sum_{j=0}^\infty \|P_{2^{-j}K} f\|_{q,h} \\ &\le C(q,d) \sum_{j=0}^\infty (2^{-j}K)^{\frac{d}{2}-\frac{d}{q}} \|P_{2^{-j}K} f\|_{2,h} \\ &= C(q,d) \sum_{j=0}^\infty (2^{-j}K)^{\theta} \|P_{2^{-j}K} f\|_{2,h}. \end{aligned} \tag{89}$$

Again by Lemma 45,

$$\|P_{2^{-j}K} f\|_{2,h} \le \|f\|_{2,h}, \tag{90}$$

and by Lemma 47, there is a universal constant C_0 such that for all $j \ge 0$,

$$\|P_{2^{-j}K} f\|_{2,h} \le C_0 2^j h G_h(f)^{1/2}. \tag{91}$$

Let $j_0 \in \mathbb{Z}$ be the unique integer such that

$$C_0 2^{j_0-1} h G_h(f)^{1/2} \le \|f\|_{2,h} \le C_0 2^{j_0} h G_h(f)^{1/2}.$$

Then note that

$$\sum_{j>j_0} 2^{-\theta j} K^\theta \le C(q,d) 2^{-\theta j_0} K^\theta \le C(q,d)\biggl(\frac{G_h(f)^{1/2}}{\|f\|_{2,h}}\biggr)^\theta, \tag{92}$$

and similarly

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{j\le j_0} 2^{(1-\theta)j} K^\theta h &\le C(q,d) 2^{(1-\theta)j_0} h^{1-\theta}\\ &\le C(q,d)\biggl(\frac{\|f\|_{2,h}}{G_h(f)^{1/2}}\biggr)^{1-\theta}. \end{aligned}\tag{93}$$

Combining (89), (90), (91), (92) and (93) we get

$$\begin{aligned}\|f\|_{q,h} &\le C(q,d)\sum_{j=0}^\infty (2^{-j}K)^\theta \|P_{2^{-j}K} f\|_{2,h}\\ &\le C(q,d) \sum_{j=j_0+1}^\infty (2^{-j}K)^\theta \|f\|_{2,h}\\ &\quad + C(q,d)\sum_{j=-\infty}^{j_0} (2^{-j}K)^\theta 2^j h G_h(f)^{1/2}\\ &\le C(q,d)\|f\|_{2,h}^{1-\theta} G_h(f)^{\theta/2}.\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of the discrete Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality. □

16.6. **Green's function.** Let Δ be the Laplacian operator on $\mathbb{C}^{\mathbb{Z}^d}$ with grid size h, i.e.

$$\Delta f(x) = \frac{1}{h^2}\sum_{y\,:\, y\sim x} (f(y)-f(x)).$$

Lemma 49. *Let I be the identity operator on $\mathbb{C}^{\mathbb{Z}^d}$ and ω be any positive real number. For any $u\in L^2(\mathbb{Z}^d)$, the unique solution to the equation*

$$(\omega I-\Delta)f = u$$

is given by $f = g * u$, where g is the discrete Green's function

$$g(x) = \frac{h^{2-d}}{2d}\sum_{k=0}^\infty r^{k+1} p(x,k), \tag{94}$$

where $r = 2d/(2d+\omega h^2)$ and $p(x,k)$ is the probability that a d-dimensional simple symmetric random walk started at the origin is at x at time k.

Proof. Note that Δ is negative semidefinite, since

$$(f,\Delta f) = -\frac{1}{2h^2}\sum_{\substack{x,y\in\mathbb{Z}^d\\ x\sim y}} |f_x - f_y|^2.$$

Thus for any positive ω, $\omega I - \Delta$ is a positive definite operator. In particular, given a function $u \in L^2(\mathbb{Z}^d)$, there can be at most one solution of

$$(\omega I - \Delta) f = u.$$

To show that $g * u$ is a solution, one proceeds exactly as in the proof of Lemma 28. ☐

The Green's function is an indispensable tool in classical harmonic analysis. While the continuum Green's functions are relatively simple objects, the discrete ones are more complicated. The purpose of this Subsection is to derive some careful estimates for the discrete Green's functions.

Lemma 50. *Let $p(x,k)$ be as in Lemma 49. Then for all $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ and $k \geq 0$,*

$$p(x,k) \leq C(d) e^{-|x|^2/2k} (1+k)^{-d/2},$$

where we interpret $|x|^2/2k$ as ∞ if $x \neq 0$ and $k = 0$, and as 0 if $x = 0$ and $k = 0$.

Proof. Suppose we are given $x = (x_1, \ldots, x_d) \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, $k \geq 0$, and $k_1, \ldots, k_d$ summing to k. If we know that for each $i = 1, \ldots, d$, the walk has taken a total of k_i steps along the ith coordinate axis, then the number of ways that the walk can be at x at step k is exactly

$$\prod_{i=1}^d \binom{k_i}{(k_i + x_i)/2},$$

where the combinatorial term is understood to be zero if $k_i + x_i$ is odd, or if $x_i \notin [-k_i, k_i]$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} p(x,k) &= (2d)^{-k} \sum_{\substack{0 \leq k_1, \ldots, k_d \leq k \\ k_1 + \cdots + k_d = k}} \frac{k!}{k_1! \cdots k_d!} \prod_{i=1}^d \binom{k_i}{(k_i + x_i)/2} \\ &= \sum_{\substack{0 \leq k_1, \ldots, k_d \leq k \\ k_1 + \cdots + k_d = k}} \frac{k! d^{-k}}{k_1! \cdots k_d!} \prod_{i=1}^d \binom{k_i}{(k_i + x_i)/2} 2^{-k_i}. \end{aligned} \tag{95}$$

Suppose k balls are dropped independently and uniformly at random into d boxes. Let K_i be the number of balls falling into the ith box. Then for any $0 \leq k_1, \ldots, k_d \leq k$ such that $k_1 + \cdots + k_d = k$,

$$\mathbb{P}(K_1 = k_1, \ldots, K_d = k_d) = \frac{k! d^{-k}}{k_1! \cdots k_d!}.$$

Therefore,

$$p(x,k) = \mathbb{E}\biggl(\prod_{i=1}^d \binom{K_i}{(K_i + x_i)/2} 2^{-K_i}\biggr). \tag{96}$$

A simple computation using Stirling's formula (e.g. the matching upper and lower bounds in [50]) shows that there is a universal constant C such that for any integers $a \geq 1$ and $b \in [-a, a]$ such that $a + b$ is even,

$$\begin{aligned}\log\biggl(\binom{a}{(a+b)/2}2^{-a}\biggr) \leq C - \frac{1}{2}\log a - \frac{a+b+1}{2}\log\biggl(1+\frac{b}{a}\biggr)\\ - \frac{a-b+1}{2}\log\biggl(1-\frac{b}{a}\biggr).\end{aligned}$$

It is easy to verify that for any $x \in (-1, \infty)$, $\log(1+x) \geq x - \frac{x^2}{2}$. Applying this to control the logarithms on the right-hand side of the above expression, one gets

$$\binom{a}{(a+b)/2}2^{-a} \leq C\frac{e^{-b^2/2a}}{\sqrt{a}}.$$

This holds for $a \geq 1$. To include $a = 0$, one modifies the inequality slightly to get

$$\binom{a}{(a+b)/2}2^{-a} \leq C\frac{e^{-b^2/2a}}{\sqrt{1+a}}. \tag{97}$$

Using this bound in (96) and applying Hölder's inequality, we get

$$\begin{aligned}p(x,k) &\leq C(d)\mathbb{E}\biggl(e^{-\sum_{i=1}^d x_i^2/2K_i}\prod_{i=1}^d(1+K_i)^{-1/2}\biggr)\\ &\leq C(d)e^{-|x|^2/2k}\mathbb{E}\biggl(\prod_{i=1}^d(1+K_i)^{-1/2}\biggr)\\ &\leq C(d)e^{-|x|^2/2k}\biggl(\prod_{i=1}^d\mathbb{E}(1+K_i)^{-d/2}\biggr)^{1/d}. \qquad (98)\end{aligned}$$

(The interpretation for $k = 0$ is as in the statement of the Lemma.)

Now, each K_i has a Binomial distribution with parameters k and $1/d$. Therefore by Hoeffding's inequality [25],

$$\mathbb{P}(K_i \leq k/2d) \leq e^{-C(d)k},$$

which clearly shows that for any $r > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}(1+K_i)^{-r} &\leq \mathbb{P}(K_i \leq k/2d) + (1+k/2d)^{-r}\\ &\leq C(d,r)(1+k)^{-r}.\end{aligned} \tag{99}$$

Plugging this into (98) proves the lemma. □

Lemma 51. *Suppose that $f : [0,\infty) \to [0,\infty)$ is a non-increasing function and $g : [0,\infty) \to [0,\infty)$ is a non-decreasing function. Then*

$$\sum_{k=0}^\infty f(k+1)g(k) \leq \int_0^\infty f(t)g(t)dt.$$

More generally,

$$\sum_{x\in\mathbb{Z}^d}^{\infty} f(|x|+\sqrt{d})g(|x|) \le \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(|y|)g(|y|)dy.$$

Proof. For the first part, simply observe that when $t \in [k,k+1]$, $f(t) \ge f(k+1)$ and $g(t) \ge g(k)$, so that $f(k+1)g(k) \le \int_k^{k+1} f(t)g(t)dt$.

For the second part, let $\mathbb{Z}_+ = \{0,1,\ldots\}$ and $\mathbb{R}_+ = [0,\infty)$. Then

$$\sum_{x\in\mathbb{Z}^d}^{\infty} f(|x|+\sqrt{d})g(|x|) \le 2^d \sum_{x\in\mathbb{Z}_+^d} f(|x|+\sqrt{d})g(|x|)$$

and

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(|y|)g(|y|)dy = 2^d \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^d} f(|y|)g(|y|)dy,$$

so that it suffices to prove

$$\sum_{x\in\mathbb{Z}_+^d}^{\infty} f(|x|+\sqrt{d})g(|x|) \le \int_{\mathbb{R}_+^d} f(|y|)g(|y|)dy.$$

Take any $x \in \mathbb{Z}_+^d$. Let $B(x)$ be the set

$$\{y \in \mathbb{R}^d : x_i \le y_i < x_i + 1,\ i = 1,\ldots,d\}.$$

The sets $B(x)$ are pairwise disjoint and all have volume 1. Moreover, on the set $B(x)$, $|x| \le |y| \le |x| + \sqrt{d}$, and therefore

$$f(|x|+\sqrt{d})g(|x|) \le \int_{B(x)} f(|y|)g(|y|)dy.$$

This completes the proof of the lemma. □

Lemma 52. *Given $\omega > 0$, let $r = 2d/(2d+\omega h^2)$, as in Lemma 49. Take any $\beta > 0$, $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ and $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$. Let*

$$S := \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} r^{k+1} e^{-\beta|x|^2/k}(1+k)^{-\alpha/2}.$$

The following bounds hold:

(a) *If $\alpha > 2$, then*

$$S \le C(d,\alpha,\beta)\big(\sqrt{d}+|x|\big)^{2-\alpha} e^{-C(d,\beta,\omega)h|x|}.$$

(b) *If $\alpha = 2$ then*

$$S \le C(d,\alpha,\beta)\big(C(\beta) + C(\beta)\big|\log(h(\sqrt{d}+|x|))\big|\big) e^{-C(d,\beta,\omega)h|x|}.$$

(c) *If $\alpha < 2$, then*

$$S \le C(d,\alpha,\beta)h^{\alpha-2} e^{-C(d,\beta,\omega)h|x|}.$$

In all three cases, $C(d,\beta,\omega)$ is an increasing function of ω.

Proof. First, assume that $x \neq 0$. For any $y \geq 0$,

$$\log(1+y) = \int_0^y \frac{1}{1+z}dz \geq \frac{y}{1+y}.$$

Consequently, for any $K > 0$ and $x \in [0,1]$,

$$\frac{1}{1+Kx} = e^{-\log(1+Kx)} \leq e^{-Kx/(1+Kx)} \leq e^{-Kx/(1+K)}.$$

Since $h \in (0,1)$, the above inequality shows that

$$r = \frac{2d}{2d+\omega h^2} = \frac{1}{1+\frac{\omega}{2d}h^2} \leq e^{-C(d,\omega)h^2}, \tag{100}$$

where $C(d,\omega)$ is an increasing function of ω.

By Lemma 50 , Lemma 51 and the inequality (100),

$$\begin{aligned} S &\leq \int_0^\infty r^t e^{-\beta|x|^2/t} t^{-\alpha/2} dt \\ &\leq \int_0^\infty e^{-C(d,\omega)h^2 t - \beta|x|^2/t} t^{-\alpha/2} dt. \end{aligned}$$

Applying the change-of-variable $u = |x|^2/t$ in the above integration, we get

$$S \leq |x|^{2-\alpha} \int_0^\infty \exp\biggl(-\frac{A}{u} - \beta u\biggr) u^{(\alpha-4)/2} du,$$

where $A = C(d,\omega)h^2|x|^2$. The inequality $a^2 + b^2 \geq 2ab$ shows that for all $u > 0$,

$$\frac{A}{2u} + \frac{\beta u}{2} \geq \frac{\sqrt{A\beta}}{2} =: B.$$

Consequently,

$$S \leq |x|^{2-\alpha} e^{-B} \int_0^\infty \exp\biggl(-\frac{A}{2u} - \frac{\beta u}{2}\biggr) u^{(\alpha-4)/2} du.$$

When $\alpha > 2$, the integrand may be bounded by a constant that depends only on β, α and d (and not x), by simply dropping the $A/2u$ term.

Next, consider the case $\alpha = 2$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\sqrt{A}}^\infty \exp\biggl(-\frac{A}{2u} - \frac{\beta u}{2}\biggr) u^{-1} du &\leq \int_{\sqrt{A}}^\infty e^{-\beta u/2} u^{-1} du \\ &\leq C(\beta) + C(\beta)|\log A|, \end{aligned}$$

and by the change of variable $z = A/u$,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^{\sqrt{A}} \exp\biggl(-\frac{A}{2u} - \frac{\beta u}{2}\biggr) u^{-1} du &\leq \int_{\sqrt{A}}^\infty \frac{e^{-z/2}}{z} dz \\ &\leq C + C|\log A|. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, consider the case $\alpha < 2$. Again by the change of variable $z = A/u$,

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^\infty \exp\biggl(-\frac{A}{2u} - \frac{\beta u}{2}\biggr) u^{(\alpha-4)/2} du &\le A^{(\alpha-2)/2}\int_0^\infty e^{-z/2} z^{-\alpha/2} dz\\ &\le C(\alpha) A^{(\alpha-2)/2}.\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proofs of all three cases when $x \neq 0$. When $x = 0$, the steps are essentially the same, but simpler. □

Proposition 53. *Suppose that $d \ge 3$. Given $\omega > 0$, define g as in (94). Then for all $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$,*

$$g(x) \le C(d) h^{2-d} (\sqrt{d} + |x|)^{2-d} e^{-C(d,\omega)h|x|},$$

where $C(d,\omega)$ is an increasing function of ω (when d is fixed).

Proof. First, suppose that $x \neq 0$. Then by Lemma 49 and Lemma 50,

$$g(x) \le C(d) h^{2-d} \sum_{k=0}^\infty r^{k+1} e^{-|x|^2/2k} (1+k)^{-d/2}.$$

Lemma 52 now completes the proof. □

Corollary 54. *Suppose that $d \ge 3$ and g is the Green's function defined in (94). Then for any $t \in [1, d/(d-2))$, $\|g\|_{t,h} \le C(t,d,\omega)$, where $C(t,d,\omega)$ is a decreasing function of ω.*

Proof. Let $A = 2\sqrt{d}$. By Proposition 53,

$$\begin{aligned}\|g\|_{t,h}^t \le h^d &\sum_{\substack{x\in\mathbb{Z}^d\\ |x|\le A/h}} C(t,d)\bigl(h^{2-d}(\sqrt{d}+|x|)^{2-d}\bigr)^t\\ &+ \sum_{\substack{x\in\mathbb{Z}^d\\ |x|> A/h}} C(t,d) e^{-C_0(d,\omega)h|x|t},\end{aligned}$$

where $C_0(d,\omega)$ is an increasing function of ω. By Lemma 51 and the assumption that $h < 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}h^d \sum_{\substack{x\in\mathbb{Z}^d\\ |x|> A/h}} e^{-C_0(d,\omega)h|x|t} &= e^{C_0(d,\omega)t\sqrt{d}} h^d \sum_{x\in\mathbb{Z}^d} e^{-C_0(d,\omega)h(|x|+\sqrt{d})t} 1_{\{|x|>A/h\}}\\ &\le e^{C_0(d,\omega)t\sqrt{d}} h^d \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{-C_0(d,\omega)h|y|t} 1_{\{|y|>A/h\}} dy\\ &= e^{C_0(d,\omega)t\sqrt{d}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e^{-C_0(d,\omega)|z|t} 1_{\{|z|>A\}} dz\\ &= e^{C_0(d,\omega)t\sqrt{d}} \int_A^\infty u^{d-1} e^{-C_0(d,\omega)ut} du.\end{aligned}$$

Since $A = 2\sqrt{d}$, it is easy to see that the last expression above can be bounded by a constant $C(t,d,\omega)$ that is a decreasing function of ω.

Again by Lemma 51,

$$\begin{aligned}
&h^d \sum_{\substack{x\in\mathbb{Z}^d\\ |x|\le A/h}} C(t,d)\big(h^{2-d}(\sqrt{d}+|x|)^{2-d}\big)^t\\
&\le C(t,d)h^d\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}(h|y|)^{(2-d)t}1_{\{|y|\le A/h+\sqrt{d}\}}dy\\
&= C(t,d)\int_{\mathbb{R}^d}|z|^{(2-d)t}1_{\{|z|\le A+h\sqrt{d}\}}dz\\
&= C(t,d)\int_0^{A+h\sqrt{d}} u^{d-1+(2-d)t}du.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $h < 1$ and $d-1+(2-d)t \ge -1+\epsilon$ for some positive $\epsilon = \epsilon(t,d)$, this shows that the integrand is bounded by $C(t,d)$ and completes the proof of the lemma. □

16.7. **Hardy-Littlewood-Sobolev inequality.** Take any $\omega > 0$ and let g be the Green's function defined in (94). Given a function $u \in L^2(\mathbb{Z}^d)$, let f be the unique solution to

$$(\omega I - \Delta)f = u,$$

so that by Lemma 49, $f = g * u$. The following proposition is a discrete analog of the Hardy-Littlewood-Sobolev theorem of fractional integration (see [57, Chapter V, Section 1.2]).

Proposition 55. *Let f and u be as above and suppose that $d \ge 3$. Let $1 < p < q < \infty$ satisfy*

$$\frac{1}{q} > \frac{1}{p} - \frac{2}{d}.$$

Then $\|f\|_{q,h} \le C(p,q,d,\omega)\|u\|_{p,h}$, where $C(p,q,d,\omega)$ is a decreasing function of ω.

This theorem is actually quite a bit simpler than the classical Hardy-Littlewood-Sobolev theorem, which includes the endpoint case $1/q = 1/p - 2/d$. Including the endpoint requires a somewhat delicate argument using the Marcinkiewicz interpolation theorem, which we can afford to avoid.

Proof. Let $s = (0,2)$ satisfy

$$\frac{1}{q} = \frac{1}{p} - \frac{s}{d}.$$

Let $t = d/(d-s)$. Then by Young's inequality,

$$\|f\|_{q,h} \le \|g\|_{t,h}\|u\|_{p,h}.$$

Since $t < d/(d-2)$, therefore by Corollary 54, $\|g\|_{t,h} \le C(p,q,d,\omega)$, where $C(p,q,d,\omega)$ is a decreasing function of ω. This completes the proof. □

16.8. **Derivatives of the Green's function.** Recall the discrete derivative operator ∇_i defined in (87). The following proposition gives an estimate on the size of $\nabla_i g$, where g is the discrete Green's function defined in (94).

Proposition 56. *Given $\omega > 0$, define g as in (94). If $d \geq 2$, then for all $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ and all $1 \leq i \leq d$,*

$$|\nabla_i g(x)| \leq C(d) h^{1-d}(\sqrt{d} + |x|)^{1-d} e^{-C(d,\omega)h|x|},$$

where $C(d, \omega)$ is an increasing function of ω. When $d = 1$,

$$|\nabla_1 g(x)| \leq C\big(1 + \big|\log(h(1 + |x|))\big|\big)e^{-C(\omega)h|x|},$$

where $C(\omega)$ is an increasing function of ω.

To prove this proposition, we first need to introduce some notation. For each non-negative integer k, let

$$P_k := \{(k_1, \ldots, k_d) \in \mathbb{Z}^d : 0 \leq k_1, \ldots, k_d \leq k,\ k_1 + \cdots + k_d = k\}.$$

For any $k \geq 0$ and any $(k_1, \ldots, k_d) \in P_k$ and $(x_1, \ldots, x_d) \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, let

$$\psi(k; k_1, \ldots, k_d; x_1, \ldots, x_d) := \frac{k! d^{-k}}{k_1! \cdots k_d!} \prod_{j=1}^{d} \binom{k_j}{(k_j + x_j)/2} 2^{-k_j}.$$

Here, as usual, we interpret $\binom{a}{b}$ as 0 if either a or b is not a non-negative integer, or if $b > a$. In other words, for the above expression to be non-zero, it is necessary and sufficient that for all j, x_j has the same parity as k_j and satisfies $|x_j| \leq k_j$.

Lemma 57. *For any $k \geq 1$, any $1 \leq i \leq d$, any $(k_1, \ldots, k_d) \in P_{k-1}$ and any $(x_1, \ldots, x_d) \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned}&\psi(k-1; k_1, \ldots, k_d; x_1, \ldots, x_d)\\ &= \psi(k; k_1, \ldots, k_i + 1, \ldots, k_d; x_1, \ldots, x_i + 1, \ldots, x_d)\frac{(k_i + x_i + 2)d}{k}.\end{aligned}$$

Proof. If $k_j + x_j$ is odd for some j, then both sides are zero. So assume that k_j has the same parity as x_j for each j. Similarly, if $|x_j| > k_j$ for some $j \neq i$, then both sides are zero. So assume that $|x_j| \leq k_j$ for all $j \neq i$.

If $|x_i| > k_i$, then the left side is zero, and there are three possibilities for the right side. First, x_i may be equal to $-k_i - 2$. In that case, $k_i + x_i + 2 = 0$ and so the right side is zero. The other possibilities are that $x_i < -k_i - 2$ or $x_i \geq k_i + 1$. In both of these cases, $|x_i + 1| > k_i + 1$, and hence the right side is zero. Note that the case $x_i = -k_i - 1$ is excluded because x_i has the same parity as k_i. Therefore in all three cases we have equality of the two sides. So we may now safely assume that $|x_i| \leq k_i$.

At this point, we have that both sides are non-zero. Verifying the identity is now a simple algebraic exercise. ☐

Proof of Proposition 56. Take any $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ such that $\sum_{i=1}^d x_i$ is even. Then $p(x,k) = 0$ for all odd k and $p(x+e_i,k)$ is zero for all even k, where e_i denotes the ith coordinate vector. Thus, from the expression (94),

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{g(x+e_i)-g(x)}{h} &= \frac{h^{1-d}}{2d}\biggl(\sum_{k \text{ even}} r^{k+1}p(x,k) - \sum_{k \text{ odd}} r^{k+1}p(x+e_i,k)\biggr)\\ &= \frac{h^{1-d}}{2d}\sum_{k \text{ even}} r^{k+1}(1-r)p(x,k) \\ &\quad + \frac{h^{1-d}}{2d}\sum_{k \text{ odd}} r^{k+1}(p(x,k-1)-p(x+e_i,k)).\end{aligned} \tag{101}$$

Now fix some odd k and some $1 \le i \le d$. Then by the formula (95),

$$p(x,k-1) = \sum_{(k_1,\ldots,k_d)\in P_{k-1}} \psi(k-1;k_1,\ldots,k_d;x_1,\ldots x_d) \tag{102}$$

and

$$p(x+e_i,k) = \sum_{(k_1,\ldots,k_d)\in P_k} \psi(k;k_1,\ldots,k_d;x_1,\ldots,x_i+1,\ldots,x_d). \tag{103}$$

Let P_k' be the set of all $(k_1,\ldots,k_d) \in P_k$ with $k_i \ne 0$. It is easy to see that the map

$$(k_1,\ldots,k_d) \mapsto (k_1,\ldots,k_{i-1},k_i+1,k_{i+1},\ldots,k_d)$$

is a bijection between P_{k-1} and P_k'. Thus, by Lemma 57,

$$\begin{aligned}&p(x,k-1) = \sum_{(k_1,\ldots,k_d)\in P_{k-1}} \psi(k-1;k_1,\ldots,k_d;x_1,\ldots,x_d)\\ &= \sum_{(k_1,\ldots,k_d)\in P_{k-1}} \psi(k;k_1,\ldots,k_i+1,\ldots,k_d;x_1,\ldots,x_i+1,\ldots,x_d)\frac{(k_i+x_i+2)d}{k}\\ &= \sum_{(k_1,\ldots,k_d)\in P_k'} \psi(k;k_1,\ldots,k_d;x_1,\ldots,x_i+1,\ldots,x_d)\frac{(k_i+x_i+1)d}{k}.\end{aligned}$$

By (102) and (103), this shows that

$$\begin{aligned}&|p(x,k-1)-p(x+e_i,k)|\\ &\le \sum_{(k_1,\ldots,k_d)\in P_k} \psi(k;k_1,\ldots,k_d;x_1,\ldots,x_i+1,\ldots,x_d)\biggl|\frac{(k_i+x_i+1)d}{k}1_{\{k_i\ne 0\}} - 1\biggr|.\end{aligned}$$

Let $K_1, \ldots, K_d$ be the random variables defined in the proof of Lemma 50. Then by the above inequality and (97), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&|p(x, k-1) - p(x+e_i, k)| \\
&\le \mathbb{E}\biggl(2^{-k}\biggl|\frac{(K_i + x_i + 1)d}{k} 1_{\{K_i \ne 0\}} - 1\biggr| \prod_{j=1}^d \binom{K_j}{(K_j + x_j + 1_{\{j=i\}})/2}\biggr) \\
&\le C(d) e^{-|x|^2/2k} \mathbb{E}\biggl(\biggl|\frac{(K_i + x_i + 1)d}{k} 1_{\{K_i \ne 0\}} - 1\biggr| \prod_{j=1}^d (1+K_j)^{-1/2}\biggr).
\end{aligned}$$

Now observe the following:

- By (99), for all $r > 0$, $\mathbb{E}(1+K_i)^{-r} \le C(d,r)(1+k)^{-r}$. By Hölder's inequality, this gives

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}\biggl(\biggl|\frac{(K_i + x_i + 1)d}{k} 1_{\{K_i \ne 0\}} - 1\biggr| \prod_{j=1}^d (1+K_j)^{-1/2}\biggr) \\
&\le (1+k)^{-d/2} \biggl(\mathbb{E}\biggl|\frac{(K_i + x_i + 1)d}{k} 1_{\{K_i \ne 0\}} - 1\biggr|^{d+1}\biggr)^{1/(d+1)}.
\end{aligned}$$

- Since $|x_i|/k \le (|x|/\sqrt{k})k^{-1/2}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\biggl(\mathbb{E}\biggl|\frac{(K_i + x_i + 1)d}{k} 1_{\{K_i \ne 0\}} - 1\biggr|^{d+1}\biggr)^{1/(d+1)} \\
&\le \frac{|x|}{\sqrt{k}} k^{-1/2} + \frac{d}{k} + \biggl(\mathbb{E}\biggl|\frac{K_i d}{k} 1_{\{K_i \ne 0\}} - 1\biggr|^{d+1}\biggr)^{1/(d+1)}.
\end{aligned}$$

- Since K_i is a Binomial random variable with parameters k and $1/d$, it follows by Hoeffding's tail bound [25] that $\mathbb{P}(K_i = 0) \le e^{-C(d)k}$. Moreover, $K_i \le k$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\biggl(\mathbb{E}\biggl|\frac{K_i d}{k} 1_{\{K_i \ne 0\}} - 1\biggr|^{d+1}\biggr)^{1/(d+1)} \\
&\le e^{-C(d)k} + \biggl(\mathbb{E}\biggl|\frac{K_i d}{k} - 1\biggr|^{d+1}\biggr)^{1/(d+1)}.
\end{aligned}$$

- Again by Hoeffding's bound, for any $r > 0$,

$$\mathbb{E}\biggl|\frac{K_i d}{k} - 1\biggr|^r \le C(d,r) k^{-r/2}.$$

Combining all of the above, we see that for any odd k,

$$|p(x, k-1) - p(x+e_i, k)| \le C_1(d) k^{-(d+1)/2} e^{-C_2(d)|x|^2/k} \tag{104}$$

Using this estimate and Lemma 50 to bound the right-hand side in (101), and applying Lemma 52, we get that for $d \geq 2$,

$$\begin{aligned}|\nabla_i g(x)| &\leq C(d)h^{3-d}(\sqrt{d}+|x|)^{2-d}e^{-C(d,\omega)h|x|}\\ &\quad + C(d)h^{1-d}(\sqrt{d}+|x|)^{1-d}e^{-C(d,\omega)h|x|},\end{aligned}$$

where $C(d,\omega)$ is an increasing function of ω. This proves Proposition 56 when $d \geq 2$.

When $d = 1$, we use (104), (101), (94) and Lemma 50 to get

$$\begin{aligned}|\nabla_i g(x)| &\leq Ch^2 \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} r^{k+1}e^{-|x|^2/2k}(1+k)^{-1/2}\\ &\quad + C\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} r^{k+1}e^{-|x|^2/2k}(1+k)^{-1}.\end{aligned}$$

Lemma 52 now completes the proof. □

Corollary 58. *For any d and any $1 \leq i \leq d$,*

$$\|\nabla_i g\|_{1,h} \leq C(d,\omega),$$

where $C(d,\omega)$ is a decreasing function of ω.

Proof. Follows easily from Proposition 58 and Lemma 51. □

17. REGULARITY OF DISCRETE SOLITONS

Suppose that $1 < p < 1 + 4/d$. As in Section 16, assume that $h \in (0,1)$. Take any $m > 0$ and let $f \in L^2(\mathbb{Z}^d)$ be a ground state soliton of mass m for the discrete NLS on $\mathbb{Z}^d$ under grid size h. That is, f minimizes energy among all functions of mass m. By Theorem 36 it is easy to see that at least one such function exists. Also, by elementary Euler-Lagrange techniques, it follows that there is an $\omega > 0$ such that f satisfies the soliton equation $(\omega I - \Delta)f = |f|^{p-1}f$, where I is the identity operator and Δ is the discrete Laplacian at grid size h as defined in (16).

The purpose of this section is to prove regularity properties of discrete solitons. The main goal will be to prove that the smoothness bounds remain uniformly bounded as the grid size goes to zero. This is necessary for proving convergence to continuum solitons. The proof follows more or less the sketch of the proof of regularity for continuum solitons (see [62, Proposition B.7]), but using the discrete estimates from Section 16.

In this section, C will denote any positive constant that depends only on p, d and m. In particular, C will not depend on h. Moreover, we impose the additional condition that C is uniformly bounded as m ranges over any given compact subinterval of $(0,\infty)$. We will call this the *uniform boundedness condition.* If C depends on additional parameters $a, b, \ldots$, then it is denoted as $C(a, b, \ldots)$.

Lemma 59. *$\omega \geq 1/C$.*

Proof. Following exactly the same steps as in the proof of Lemma 27, we arrive at the inequality

$$\omega \geq -\frac{E_{\min}(m,h)}{m}.$$

The uniform boundedness condition holds due to Lemma 11. $\square$

Lemma 60. *$G_h(f) \leq C$.*

Proof. Taking $q = p+1$ and

$$\theta = \frac{d(p-1)}{2(p+1)},$$

the discrete Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality (Proposition 48) implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \|f\|_{p+1,h}^{p+1} &\leq C\|f\|_{2,h}^{(1-\theta)(p+1)} G_h(f)^{\theta(p+1)/2} \\ &\leq C G_h(f)^{d(p-1)/4}. \end{aligned}$$

(Note that, since $h > 0$, $f \in L^2$ implies that $f \in L^q$. Also, it is easy to verify using the condition $1 < p < 1 + 4/d$ that $\theta \in (0,1)$. Lastly, note that the uniform boundedness condition on C is clearly satisfied.) Now, $H_h(f) = E_{\min}(m,h) < 0$ by Lemma 11. Consequently, by the previous display,

$$\begin{aligned} G_h(f) &= H_h(f) + N_h(f) \\ &\leq C\|f\|_{p+1,h}^{p+1} \leq C G_h(f)^{d(p-1)/4}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $1 < p < 1 + 4/d$, or equivalently, $d(p-1)/4 \in (0,1)$, this shows that $G_h(f) \leq C$. $\square$

Lemma 61. *For all $q \in [2,\infty]$, $\|f\|_{q,h} \leq C(q)$.*

Proof. The case $q = 2$ is already known from the assumption that $M_h(f) = m$. First, assume that $q \in (2,\infty)$. If $d \leq 2$, then for any such q, we can find $\theta \in (0,1)$ satisfying (88), and therefore by the discrete Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality and Lemma 60, it follows that $\|f\|_{q,h} \leq C(q)$ for all $2 < q < \infty$.

Next, suppose that $d \geq 3$. By the discrete Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality (Proposition 48) and Lemma 60, we have that $\|f\|_{q,h} \leq C(q)$ for all $2 \leq q < 2d/(d-2)$.

Define a sequence q_k as follows. Let $q_0 := 2d/(d-2)$. Note that the condition $p < 1 + 4/d$ implies that $q_0 > p+1$. For each k, let q_{k+1} satisfy

$$\frac{1}{q_{k+1}} = \frac{p}{q_k} - \frac{2}{d},$$

unless the right hand side is nonpositive, in which let $q_{k+1} = \infty$. If $q_k = \infty$ for some k, then this definition implies that $q_j = \infty$ for all $j \geq k$.

Note that if q_k is finite for all k, then for each k we must have

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{q_k} &= \frac{p^k}{q_0} - \frac{2}{d}(1 + p + \cdots + p^{k-1}) \\ &= \frac{p^k}{2d}\biggl(d - 2 - \frac{4}{p}\sum_{i=0}^{k-1} p^{-i}\biggr).\end{aligned}$$

But as $k \to \infty$,

$$\frac{4}{p}\sum_{i=0}^{k-1} p^{-i} \to \frac{4}{p-1} > d - 2.$$

This shows that q_k must become infinity at some finite k.

Next, note that q_k is an increasing sequence. This is easily proved by induction as follows. Suppose that $q_k \ge q_0 = 2d/(d-2)$. If $q_{k+1} = \infty$, there is nothing to prove. Otherwise, by the condition $p < 1 + 4/d$,

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{q_k} - \frac{1}{q_{k+1}} &= \frac{2}{d} - \frac{p-1}{q_k} \\ &\ge \frac{2}{d} - \frac{(p-1)(d-2)}{2d} > 0.\end{aligned}$$

Take any k such that $q_k < \infty$. Suppose we have proved that for all $q \in [2, q_k)$,

$$\|f\|_{q,h} \le C(q). \tag{105}$$

Choose arbitrary $q \in [q_k, q_{k+1})$. Then $1 < q_k/p < q < \infty$, and

$$\frac{1}{q} > \frac{1}{q_{k+1}} \ge \frac{p}{q_k} - \frac{2}{d}.$$

Take $q' \in [2, q_k)$ so close to q_k that

$$\frac{1}{q} > \frac{p}{q'} - \frac{2}{d}.$$

Let $f_0 := |f|^{p-1}f$. Since $f = (\omega I - \Delta)^{-1} f_0$ and $\omega \ge 1/C$ by Lemma 59, it follows by the discrete Hardy-Littlewood-Sobolev inequality (Proposition 55) that

$$\begin{aligned}\|f\|_q &\le C(q, q')\|f_0\|_{q'/p} \\ &= C(q, q')\|f\|_{q'}^p \le C(q, q').\end{aligned}$$

However, q' can be chosen depending only on q, p and d. Since the sequence q_k increases to infinity, this proves by induction that $\|f\|_{q,h} \le C(q)$ for all $q \in (2, \infty)$.

(An important thing to note is that we crucially used the fact that the constant in Proposition 55 is a decreasing function of ω, in conjunction with Lemma 59, to conclude that $C(q)$ may be chosen to depend on ω only through m and not on the actual value of ω, and that moreover, $C(q)$ satisfies the uniform boundedness condition.)

Next, consider the case $q = \infty$. Take any $r > d/2$. Let $r' = r/(r-1)$, so that $r' < d/(d-2)$. Then by Corollary 54, Young's inequality, Lemma 59 and what we have already proved above,

$$\|f\|_{\infty,h} = \|g * f_0\|_{\infty,h} \le \|g\|_{r',h}\|f_0\|_{r,h} = \|g\|_{r',h}\|f\|_{pr,h} \le C.$$

This completes the proof. □

Lemma 62. *For any* $q \in [2,\infty]$ *and any* $1 \le i, j \le d$,

$$\|\nabla_i f\|_{q,h} \le C(q) \quad \textit{and} \quad \|\nabla_i \nabla_j f\|_{q,h} \le C(q).$$

Proof. Since the ground state soliton minimizes energy, and the function $|f|$ satisfies $M_h(f) = M_h(|f|)$ and $H_h(|f|) \le H_h(f)$ by the triangle inequality, therefore we must have $H_h(|f|) = H_h(f)$. Consequently, $||f(x)| - |f(y)|| = |f(x) - f(y)|$ for each neighboring pair of points (x, y), which shows that f must be of the form $f(x) = \alpha f_1(x)$ for some constant $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$ with $|\alpha| = 1$ and some function $f_1 : \mathbb{Z}^d \to [0,\infty)$. Therefore, without loss of generality we will assume in this proof that f is a non-negative function.

By Young's inequality, Lemma 61, and the observation that ∇_i is a convolution operator, we have that for any $q \in [2,\infty]$,

$$\begin{aligned}\|\nabla_i f\|_{q,h} &= \|(\nabla_i g) * f^p\|_{q,h} \\ &\le \|\nabla_i g\|_{1,h}\|f^p\|_{q,h} \le C(q)\|\nabla_i g\|_{1,h}.\end{aligned} \tag{106}$$

Next, note that by the inequality $|a^p - b^p| \le \max\{pa^{p-1}, pb^{p-1}\}|a-b|$ for non-negative a and b (which follows by the mean value theorem), and fact that $\|f\|_{\infty,h} \le C$ from Lemma 61, we have that for all x,

$$|\nabla_i f^p(x)| \le C|\nabla_i f(x)|.$$

In particular, by Lemma 61 this implies that for all $q \in [2,\infty]$,

$$\|\nabla_i f^p\|_{q,h} \le C\|\nabla_i f\|_{q,h} \le C(q). \tag{107}$$

By the commutativity of convolution operators,

$$\nabla_i \nabla_j f = (\nabla_i g) * (\nabla_j f^p).$$

Thus, by Young's inequality and (107), we see that for any $q \in [2,\infty]$,

$$\begin{aligned}\|\nabla_i \nabla_j f\|_{q,h} &\le \|\nabla_i g\|_{1,h}\|\nabla_j f^p\|_{q,h} \\ &\le C(q)\|\nabla_i g\|_{1,h}.\end{aligned} \tag{108}$$

Applying Corollary 58 (in conjunction with Lemma 59) to (106) and (108) completes the proof. The uniform boundedness condition follows from the monotonicity of the constant in Corollary 58. □

18. Continuum limit of discrete solitons

In this section we establish that discrete solitons converge to continuum solitons as the grid size goes to zero, provided that the nonlinearity is mass-subcritical.

Assume that $1 < p < 1 + 4/d$. Fix $h > 0$, $m > 0$ and let f be a ground state soliton of mass m for the DNLS system (17) on $\mathbb{Z}^d$ at grid size h. Let $Q_{\lambda(m)}$ be the unique ground state soliton of mass m for the continuum system (3). Let $\tilde{f}$ be the continuum image of f at grid size h, as defined in Section 2.

Theorem 63. *For any $q \in [2, \infty]$,*

$$\tilde{L}^q(\tilde{f}, Q_{\lambda(m)}) \le C(p, d, m, q, h),$$

where $C(p, d, m, q, h)$ satisfies, for any $0 < m_0 \le m_1 < \infty$ and any fixed p, d and q,

$$\lim_{h\to 0} \sup_{m_0 \le m \le m_1} C(p, d, m, q, h) = 0. \tag{109}$$

The same bound also holds for $|H_h(f) - E_{\min}(m)|$ (with the modification that there is no q).

In the following, C will denote any positive constant that depends only on p, d and m, satisfying the uniform boundedness condition defined in Section 17: that is, C remains uniformly bounded as m varies over a compact subinterval of $(0, \infty)$, with p and d fixed. If C depends on additional parameters $a, b, \ldots$, then it will be written as $C(a, b, \ldots)$. We will also adopt the convention that $o(1)$ denotes any constant that depends only on p, d, m and h and satisfies (109).

Let $w : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ be the function

$$w(t) := \begin{cases} 1 - |t| & \text{if } |t| \le 1, \\ 0 & \text{if } |t| > 1. \end{cases}$$

Extend w to $\mathbb{R}^d$ as

$$w(t_1, \ldots, t_d) := w(t_1)w(t_2)\cdots w(t_d).$$

Define a function $f^c : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{C}$ as

$$f^c(y) := \sum_{x\in\mathbb{Z}^d} f(x) w\biggl(\frac{y - hx}{h}\biggr).$$

Lemma 64. *The function f^c is absolutely continuous. If $x \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ and $y = hx + ht$ for some $t \in (0,1)^d$, then*

$$f^c(y) = \sum_{s\in\{0,1\}^d} f(x + s) \prod_{i=1}^d t_i^{s_i}(1 - t_i)^{1-s_i}.$$

If $\partial_i f^c$ denotes the partial derivative of f in the ith coordinate, then for x and y as above,

$$\partial_i f^c(y) = \sum_{\substack{s\in\{0,1\}^d \\ s_i=0}} \nabla_i f(x+s) \prod_{\substack{1\le j\le d \\ j\ne i}} t_j^{s_j}(1-t_j)^{1-s_j}$$

Proof. Since w is absolutely continuous with bounded support, it follows easily from the definition of f^c that f^c is an absolutely continuous function on $\mathbb{R}^d$. Take x and y as in the statement of the lemma. Take any $z \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, and note that $w((y-hz)/h)$ is non-zero if and only if $|y_i/h - z_i| < 1$ for $i = 1,\ldots,d$. Since $y_i/h = x_i + t_i$ for some $t_i \in (0,1)$ for each i, therefore $w((y-hz)/h) \neq 0$ if and only if each z_i is either x_i or x_i+1. In other words,

$$\begin{aligned} f^c(y) &= \sum_{s\in\{0,1\}^d} f(x+s) w\biggl(\frac{y-hx-hs}{h}\biggr) \\ &= \sum_{s\in\{0,1\}^d} f(x+s)\prod_{i=1}^d w(t_i - s_i). \end{aligned}$$

An easy verification shows that when $s_i \in \{0,1\}$, $w(t_i - s_i) = t_i^{s_i}(1-t_i)^{1-s_i}$. This completes the proof of the first identity. For the second, note that by the previous display,

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_i f^c(y) &= \frac{1}{h}\frac{\partial}{\partial t_i} f^c(hx+ht) \\ &= \frac{1}{h}\sum_{s\in\{0,1\}^d} f(x+s)\frac{\partial}{\partial t_i}\biggl(\prod_{j=1}^d w(t_j-s_j)\biggr). \end{aligned}$$

Now,

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t_i} w(t_i - s_i) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } s_i = 1, \\ -1 & \text{if } s_i = 0. \end{cases}$$

This proves the second identity. □

Lemma 65. *The function f^c satisfies*

$$|M_h(f) - M(f^c)| \le Ch, \quad \textit{and} \quad |H_h(f) - H(f^c)| \le Ch^{2/(p+1)}.$$

Proof. For $x = (x_1,\ldots,x_d) \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, let $B(x)$ be the cube

$$B(x) := \{y \in \mathbb{R}^d : x_i \le y_i/h < x_i + 1,\ i = 1,\ldots,d\}.$$

Another way to represent $B(x)$ is $\{hx + ht : t \in [0,1)^d\}$. If y is a point in the interior of $B(x)$, then Lemma 64 shows that $f^c(y)$ is a convex combination of $\{f(x+s) : s \in \{0,1\}^d\}$. Therefore, for any $r \in [2,\infty)$,

$$|f^c(y)|^r \le \max_{s\in\{0,1\}^d} |f(x+s)|^r \le \sum_{s\in\{0,1\}^d} |f(x+s)|^r. \tag{110}$$

Consequently,

$$\int_{B(x)} |f^c(y)|^r dy \le h^d \sum_{s\in\{0,1\}^d} |f(x+s)|^r.$$

Summing over x gives

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |f^c(y)|^r dy &= \sum_{x\in\mathbb{Z}^d}\int_{B(x)} |f^c(y)|^r dy \\ &\le 2^d h^d \sum_{x\in\mathbb{Z}^d} |f(x)|^r = 2^d \|f\|_{r,h}.\end{aligned} \tag{111}$$

By Lemma 61, the bounds (110) and (111) show that for all $r\in[2,\infty]$,

$$\|f^c\|_r \le C(r). \tag{112}$$

Next, note that

$$\begin{aligned}|f^c(y) - f(x)| &\le \max_{s\in\{0,1\}^d} |f(x+s) - f(x)| \\ &\le \sum_{s\in\{0,1\}^d}\sum_{j=1}^d h|\nabla_j f(x+s)|.\end{aligned} \tag{113}$$

Recall that if $y\in B(x)$, then $\tilde{f}(y) = f(x)$. Therefore by inequality (113) and Lemma 60,

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (f^c(y) - \tilde{f}(y))^2 dy &= \sum_{x\in\mathbb{Z}^d}\int_{B(x)} (f^c(y) - f(x))^2 dy \\ &\le Ch^2 G_h(f) \le Ch^2.\end{aligned}$$

It is easy to see that for all r, $\|\tilde{f}\|_r = \|f\|_{r,h}$. Therefore, for any $r\in[2,\infty)$, by the L^∞ bounds from (112) and Lemma 61 and the above inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}\big|\|f^c\|_r - \|\tilde{f}\|_r\big| &\le \|f^c - \tilde{f}\|_r \\ &\le \|f^c - \tilde{f}\|_\infty^{1-2/r}\|f^c - \tilde{f}\|_2^{2/r} \le C(r)h^{2/r}.\end{aligned}$$

Using this bound, and again applying the L^r bounds from inequality (112) and Lemma 61, we get

$$\big|\|f^c\|_r^r - \|\tilde{f}\|_r^r\big| \le C(r)h^{2/r}. \tag{114}$$

Next, let $\partial_i f^c$ be the partial derivative of f^c in the ith coordinate. By Lemma 64,

$$\begin{aligned}|\partial_i f^c(y) - \nabla_i f(x)| &\le \max_{s\in\{0,1\}^d} |\nabla_i f(x+s) - \nabla_i f(x)| \\ &\le \sum_{s\in\{0,1\}^d}\sum_{j=1}^d h|\nabla_j\nabla_i f(x+s)|.\end{aligned} \tag{115}$$

Let $\partial_i \tilde{f}$ be the function that is identically equal to $\nabla_i f(x)$ in the interior of the box $B(x)$, and arbitrarily defined on the boundaries. Then the above inequality, together with Lemma 62, implies that

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\partial_i f^c(y) - \partial_i \tilde{f}(y))^2 dy &= \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \int_{B(x)} (\partial_i f^c(y) - \nabla_i f(x))^2 dy \\ &\le Ch^2 \max_{1 \le j \le d} \|\nabla_j \nabla_i f\|_{2,h}^2 \le Ch^2.\end{aligned}$$

Clearly for all r, $\|\partial_i \tilde{f}\|_r = \|\nabla_i f\|_{r,h}$. Therefore by the above inequality and Lemma 62, $\|\partial_i f^c\|_2$ and $\|\partial_i \tilde{f}\|_2$ are both bounded by C. Consequently, again applying the previous display,

$$\begin{aligned}\big|\|\partial_i f^c\|_2^2 - \|\partial_i \tilde{f}\|_2^2\big| &\le C\big|\|\partial_i f^c\|_2 - \|\partial_i \tilde{f}\|_2\big| \\ &\le C\|\partial_i f^c - \partial_i \tilde{f}\|_2 \\ &\le Ch.\end{aligned}$$

Using the above bound and (114), we get

$$|M_h(f) - M(f^c)| = \big|\|\tilde{f}\|_2^2 - \|f^c\|_2^2\big| \le Ch,$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}|H_h(f) - H(f^c)| &\le \big|\|\partial_i \tilde{f}\|_2^2 - \|\partial_i f^c\|_2^2\big| + \big|\|\tilde{f}\|_{p+1}^{p+1} - \|f^c\|_{p+1}^{p+1}\big| \\ &\le Ch^{2/(p+1)}.\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of the lemma. □

Let Q be the unique, positive radially symmetric solution of (7). Let $Q' := Q_{\lambda(m')}$ be the continuum ground state soliton of mass $m' := M(f^c)$. Let $\widehat{Q} : \mathbb{Z}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ be the function $\widehat{Q}(x) := Q'(hx)$.

Lemma 66. *Recall the* $o(1)$ *convention introduced immediately after the statement of Theorem* 63. *Then*

$$|M(Q') - M_h(\widehat{Q})| \le o(1) \quad \textit{and} \quad |H(Q') - H_h(\widehat{Q})| \le o(1).$$

Proof. The function Q is a Schwartz function (see the remark following the proof of Proposition B.7 in [62, Appendix B]). In other words, Q is a C^∞ function, and all its derivatives decay faster than any polynomial. This provides ample regularity of Q, and together with the scaling relation (8), this completes the proof of this lemma. □

Lemma 67. $|H(f^c) - H(Q')| \le o(1)$.

Proof. Let α be a number such that $\alpha\widehat{Q}$ has the same mass as f. In other words,

$$\alpha = \sqrt{\frac{M_h(f)}{M_h(\widehat{Q})}}.$$

By Lemma 65, $|M_h(f) - M(f^c)| \le o(1)$, and by Lemma 66, $|M(Q') - M(\widehat{Q})| \le o(1)$. But by definition of Q', $M(Q') = M(f^c)$. Thus,

$$|\alpha - 1| \le o(1). \tag{116}$$

Now recall that:

- Q is a Schwartz function (see the remark in the proof of Lemma 66).
- $|M(f^c) - m| \le o(1)$ by Lemma 65.
- Q' is related to Q by the scaling relation (8).

Combining the above, it follows easily that for all $r \in [2, \infty)$ and $1 \le i \le d$, $\|\widehat{Q}\|_{r,h} \le C(r)$ and $\|\nabla_i \widehat{Q}\|_{r,h} \le C(r)$. Together with (116), this implies that

$$|H(\alpha\widehat{Q}) - H(\widehat{Q})| \le o(1).$$

Since f is a discrete ground state soliton, therefore $H_h(\alpha\widehat{Q}) \ge H_h(f)$. Combining this with the previous display and Lemmas 65 and 66, we get

$$\begin{aligned} H(Q') \le H(f^c) &\le H_h(f) + o(1) \\ &\le H_h(\alpha\widehat{Q}) + o(1) \\ &\le H_h(\widehat{Q}) + o(1) \le H(Q') + o(1). \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of the lemma. $\square$

Lemma 68. *For any $q \in [2, \infty]$ and any absolutely continuous $v : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{C}$ such that $v \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and ∇v is uniformly bounded, we have*

$$\|v\|_q \le C(d,q)\|v\|_2^{\frac{2}{d+2}\left(1-\frac{2}{q}\right)+\frac{2}{q}} \|\nabla v\|_\infty^{\frac{d}{d+2}\left(1-\frac{2}{q}\right)},$$

where $\|\nabla v\|_\infty := \max_{1\le i\le d} \|\partial_i v\|_\infty$.

Proof. If $\|\nabla v\|_\infty = 0$, then since $v \in L^2$, therefore v must be zero almost everywhere. So let us assume that $\|\nabla v\|_\infty \in (0, \infty)$.

Take any $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Let B be the ball of radius r around x_0, where

$$r = \left(\frac{\|v\|_2}{\|\nabla v\|_\infty}\right)^{2/(d+2)}.$$

Note that

$$\frac{\int_B |v(x)|^2 dx}{\mathrm{Vol}(B)} \le \frac{\|v\|_2^2}{\mathrm{Vol}(B)},$$

which shows that there exists $y \in B$ such that

$$|v(y)|^2 \le \frac{\|v\|_2^2}{\mathrm{Vol}(B)} = C(d) r^{-d} \|v\|_2^2.$$

Since $\|x_0 - y\| \le r$, this shows that

$$\begin{aligned} |v(x_0)| &\le |v(y)| + \|x_0 - y\| \|\nabla v\|_\infty \\ &\le C(d) r^{-d/2} \|v\|_2 + Cr\|\nabla v\|_\infty \\ &\le C(d) \|v\|_2^{2/(d+2)} \|\nabla v\|_\infty^{d/(d+2)}. \end{aligned}$$

Since this is true for every x_0, the right-hand side is a bound for $\|v\|_\infty$. To complete the proof, note that for any $q \in (2, \infty)$, $\|v\|_q^q \le \|v\|_\infty^{q-2} \|v\|_2^2$. □

Proof of Theorem 63. By Lemma 65,

$$|M(f^c) - m| = |m' - m| \le o(1). \tag{117}$$

Again by Lemma 67, $|H(f^c) - H(Q')| \le o(1)$. But $H(Q') = E_{\min}(m')$, $|m' - m| \le o(1)$ and $E_{\min}$ is a continuous function by (6); consequently,

$$|H(f^c) - E_{\min}(m)| \le o(1). \tag{118}$$

Together with Lemma 65, this proves that $|H_h(f) - E_{\min}(m)| \le o(1)$.

The bounds (117) and (118), together with the orbital stability of ground state solitons (see e.g. [47, Proposition 3]) imply that

$$\tilde{L}^2(f^c, Q_{\lambda(m)}) \le o(1).$$

By (115) and Lemma 62, $\|\partial_i f^c\|_\infty \le C$ for each i. Therefore by Lemma 68, $\tilde{L}^q(f^c, Q_{\lambda(m)}) \le o(1)$ for each $q \in [2, \infty]$. □

Corollary 69. *For every fixed* $0 < m_0 \le m_1 < \infty$,

$$\lim_{h \to 0} \sup_{m_0 \le m \le m_1} |E_{\min}(m, h) - E_{\min}(m)| = 0.$$

Proof. For every $m > 0$ and $h > 0$, let $f_{m,h}$ be a discrete ground state soliton of mass m for the DNLS at grid size h. Then $E_{\min}(m, h) = H_h(f_{m,h})$. Theorem 63 completes the proof. □

19. Continuum limit of the variational problem

Recall the objects Θ, $\mathcal{M}$ an $\mathcal{R}$ defined in Section 10, and the function Ψ_d defined in (19). The following theorem shows that as the grid size goes to zero, the set $\mathcal{M}(E_0, m_0, h)$ converges to the single point $(0, E_0 - E_{\min}(m_0))$.

Theorem 70. *Fix* $m_0 > 0$ *and* $E_{\min}(m_0) < E_0 < \infty$. *For each* $h > 0$, *let* (E_h, m_h) *be an element of* $\mathcal{M}(E_0, m_0, h)$. *Then*

$$\lim_{h \to 0} m_h = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{h \to 0} E_h = E_0 - E_{\min}(m_0).$$

Proof. Recall the functions $E^+(m, h)$ and $E^-(m, h)$. If h is sufficiently small, then $E_0 < dm_0/h^2$ and by Lemma 69, $E_0 \ge E_{\min}(m_0, h)$. Therefore by Lemma 16, when h is sufficiently small,

$$E_h = E^+(m_h, h) = E_0 - E_{\min}(m_0 - m_h, h).$$

We will prove that $m_h \to 0$ as $h \to 0$ by a subsequence argument. Then by the above identity and Lemma 69, the limit for E_h will be automatically established. Let m_h tend to a point $m' \in [0, m_0]$ along a sequence $h_i \to 0$. Then by Corollary 69,

$$\lim_{i \to \infty} E_{h_i} = E' := E_0 - E_{\min}(m_0 - m') \ge 0.$$

We will show that $m' = 0$ by the method of contradiction. Suppose that $m' > 0$. Fix $m'' \in (0, m')$ and let

$$E'' := E_0 - E_{\min}(m_0 - m'').$$

Note that since $E_{\min}$ is strictly decreasing (by Lemma 41 and Lemma 11), therefore

$$E'' > E' \geq 0. \tag{119}$$

Also, defining

$$E_i'' := E_0 - E_{\min}(m_0 - m'', h_i) = E^+(m'', h_i),$$

we see that by Corollary 69,

$$\lim_{i\to\infty} E_i'' = E''. \tag{120}$$

Fix $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ and note that for all i,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Theta(E_{h_i}, m_{h_i}, h_i) - 2\log h_i \\
&\leq \log E_{h_i} - \int_{[0,1]^d} \log\biggl(\frac{(1-\gamma)h_i^2 E_{h_i}}{m_{h_i}} + 2\gamma\sum_{j=1}^d \sin^2(\pi x_j)\biggr)dx_1\cdots dx_d,
\end{aligned}$$

and therefore (since $m' > 0$),

$$\limsup_{i\to\infty}(\Theta(E_{h_i}, m_{h_i}, h_i) - 2\log h_i) \leq \log E' - C(\gamma),$$

where

$$C(\gamma) := \int_{[0,1]^d} \log\biggl(2\gamma\sum_{j=1}^d \sin^2(\pi x_j)\biggr)dx_1\cdots dx_d.$$

Since this is true for all $\gamma \in (0, 1)$, we can take $\gamma \to 1$ in the above bound and get

$$\limsup_{i\to\infty}(\Theta(E_{h_i}, m_{h_i}, h_i) - 2\log h_i) \leq \log E' - C(1). \tag{121}$$

On the other hand, for any i, (120) gives

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Theta(E_i'', m'', h_i) - 2\log h_i \\
&= \log E_i'' - \sup_{0<\gamma<1}\int_{[0,1]^d} \log\biggl(\frac{(1-\gamma)h_i^2 E_i''}{m''} + 2\gamma\sum_{j=1}^d \sin^2(\pi x_j)\biggr)dx_1\cdots dx_d \\
&\geq \log E_i'' - \int_{[0,1]^d} \log\biggl(\frac{h_i^2 E_i''}{m''} + 2\sum_{j=1}^d \sin^2(\pi x_j)\biggr)dx_1\cdots dx_d \\
&\to \log E'' - C(1) \ \text{ as } i \to \infty.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by (121) and (119), this shows that for all sufficiently large i,

$$\Theta(E_i'', m'', h_i) > \Theta(E_{h_i}, m_{h_i}, h_i). \tag{122}$$

But by the definition of E_i'', we know that $(E_i'', m'') \in \mathcal{R}(E_0, m_0, h_i)$. This contradicts the definition of (E_{h_i}, m_{h_i}) as a maximizer of $\Theta(E, m, h)$ in $\mathcal{R}(E_0, m_0, h)$. $\square$

20. Proofs of Theorems 2, 3 and 4

Proof of Theorem 2. Lemma 12 gives the formula for $E_{\max}(m, h)$. Lemma 11 and Lemma 8 show that $-\infty < E_{\min}(m, h) < 0$. The subadditive inequality follows from Lemma 41. Lastly, Corollary 69 shows that $E_{\min}(m, h) \to E_{\min}(m)$ as $h \to 0$, and that the convergence is uniform over compact subsets of $(0, \infty)$. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 3. Take any sequence of function f_k on $\mathbb{Z}^d$ such that $M_h(f_k) \to m$ and $H_h(f_k) \to E_{\min}(m, h)$ as $k \to \infty$. Let α_k be a constant such that $M(\alpha_k f_k) = m$. Then $\alpha_k \to 1$ and therefore $H_h(\alpha_k f_k)$ also tends to $E_{\min}(m, h)$. Theorem 36 now guarantees the existence of a subsequence $\alpha_{k_j} f_{k_j}$ converging to a limit $f \in \mathcal{S}(m, h)$ in the $\tilde{L}^q$ pseudometric for every $q \in [2, \infty]$. Now, f_k is uniformly L^2 bounded, and hence uniformly L^q bounded for every $q \in [2, \infty]$. Therefore, since $\alpha_{k_j} \to 1$, f_{k_j} also tends to f in $\tilde{L}^q$. This proves compactness of $\mathcal{S}(m, h)$. To prove that the set is non-empty, simply note that by the definition of $E_{\min}(m, h)$, there exists a sequence f_k satisfying $M_h(f_k) = m$ for all k and $H_h(f_k) \to E_{\min}(m, h)$. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 4. This is a direct consequence of Theorem 63. $\square$

21. Proof of Theorem 5

To be notationally compatible with the theorems of Sections 11, 13 and 14, we will write E_0 instead of E and m_0 instead of m. As in those sections, the numbers p, d, h, E_0 and m_0 will be fixed throughout this section and will be called the 'fixed parameters'. Any positive constant that depends only on the fixed parameters will be denoted simply by C, instead of $C(p, d, h, E_0, m_0)$. If the constant depends on additional parameters $a, b, \ldots$, then it will be denoted by $C(a, b, \ldots)$.

Fix n, and recall the definition of δ-soliton from Section 11. Recall also the random function ϕ defined in Section 6, and the objects Θ, $\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{R}$ defined in Section 10. Lastly, recall that the set $\mathcal{S}(m, h)$ denotes the set of discrete ground state solitons of mass m at grid size h.

Given a function $f : V_n \to \mathbb{C}$, let $f^e : \mathbb{Z}^d \to \mathbb{C}$ be the extension of f to $\mathbb{Z}^d$, defined as

$$f^e(x) = \begin{cases} f(x) & \text{if } x \in V_n, \\ 0 & \text{if } x \notin V_n. \end{cases}$$

Having defined f^e, say that f is an "improved δ-soliton" if there exists $g : \mathbb{Z}^d \to \mathbb{C}$ such that

(a) $\|f^e - g\|_\infty \le \delta$, and

(b) there exists $(E^*, m^*) \in \mathcal{M}(E_0, m_0, h)$ such that

$$|(E_0 - E^*) - H_h(g)| \le \delta \ \text{ and}$$
$$|(m_0 - m^*) - M_h(g)| \le \delta.$$

Lemma 71. *If $E_{\min}(m_0, h) < E_0 < dm_0/h^2$, then the set K in the statement of Theorem 5 can be alternatively described as*

$$\begin{aligned} K = K(h) := \{m' \in [0, m] : m' = m_0 - m^* \\ \text{for some } (E^*, m^*) \in \mathcal{M}(E_0, m_0, h)\}. \end{aligned} \tag{123}$$

Proof. Suppose that $m' \in [0, m_0]$ maximizes

$$q(m) := \log(m_0 - m) - \Psi_d\biggl(\frac{2h^2(E_0 - E_{\min}(m, h))}{m_0 - m}\biggr).$$

Let $m^* = m_0 - m'$ and $E^* = E_0 - E_{\min}(m', h) = E^+(m^*, h)$. Note that $E^+(m^*, h)$ is necessarily positive, for otherwise $q(m')$ would be $-\infty$, which is impossible since it maximizes $q(m)$ in the interval $[0, m_0]$ and $q(m) > -\infty$ for m sufficiently close to m_0. This shows that $(E^*, m^*) \in \mathcal{R}(E_0, m_0, h)$. Now take any $(E, m) \in \mathcal{M}(E_0, m_0, h)$. Then by Lemma 16, $E = E^+(m, h)$, and therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \Theta(E, m, h) &= \log m - \Psi_d\biggl(\frac{2h^2(E_0 - E_{\min}(m_0 - m, h))}{m}\biggr) \\ &= q(m_0 - m) \le q(m') = \Theta(E^*, m^*, h). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $(E^*, m^*) \in \mathcal{M}(E_0, m_0, h)$.

Next, suppose that we are given m' such that $m' = m_0 - m^*$ for some $(E^*, m^*) \in \mathcal{M}(E_0, m_0, h)$. By Lemma 16,

$$\Theta(E^*, m^*, h) = q(m').$$

Take any $m \in [0, m_0]$. We have to show that $q(m') \ge q(m)$. If $q(m) = -\infty$, there is nothing to prove. If not, then

$$0 < E_0 - E_{\min}(m, h) = E^+(m_0 - m, h).$$

Let $m_1 := m_0 - m$ and $E_1 := E^+(m_0 - m, h)$. The above display proves that

$$\max\{E^-(m_1, h), 0\} \le E_1 = E^+(m_1, h),$$

and hence $(E_1, m_1) \in \mathcal{R}(E_0, m_0, h)$. Thus,

$$q(m') = \Theta(E^*, m^*, h) \ge \Theta(E_1, m_1, h) = q(m).$$

This completes the proof of the lemma. □

Lemma 72. *For any $\eta > 0$, there exists $\delta = \delta(\eta) > 0$ depending only on η and the fixed parameters (and not on n), such that if $f : V_n \to \mathbb{C}$ is an improved δ-soliton, then there exists $v \in \mathcal{S}(m', h)$ for some $m' \in K$, such that $\tilde{L}^\infty(f^e, v) \le \eta$.*

Proof. We will argue by contradiction. Suppose that the statement of the theorem is false. Then there exists an $\eta > 0$, such that for every positive integer k, there exist n_k and a function $f_k : V_{n_k} \to \mathbb{C}$ such that f_k is an improved k^{-1}-soliton, but $\tilde{L}^\infty(f_k^e, v) > \eta$ for all $v \in \cup_{m' \in K} \mathcal{S}(m', h)$.

For each k, let g_k be a function on $\mathbb{Z}^d$ satisfying the requirements (a) and (b) in the definition of improved δ-soliton (with $\delta = k^{-1}$ and $f = f_k$). Let (E_k^*, m_k^*) be the corresponding element of $\mathcal{M}(E_0, m_0, h)$. We will show that f_k^e approaches an element of $\cup_{m' \in K} \mathcal{S}(m', h)$ in $\tilde{L}^\infty$ pseudometric through a subsequence, which will give us the necessary contradiction.

Since $\mathcal{M}(E_0, m_0, h)$ is a compact set (Lemma 16), we may assume without loss of generality that (E_k^*, m_k^*) approaches a limit $(E^*, m^*) \in \mathcal{M}(E_0, m_0, h)$ as $k \to \infty$. Let $E' := E_0 - E^*$ and $m' := m_0 - m^*$. Then $M_h(g_k) \to m'$ and $H_h(g_k) \to E'$. But by Lemma 16, $E' = E_{\min}(m', h)$. Therefore, by Theorem 3, g_k approaches some $g \in \mathcal{S}(m', h)$ in the $\tilde{L}^\infty$ pseudometric through a subsequence. Since $\|f_k^e - g_k\|_\infty \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$, this shows that f_k^e also approaches g in the $\tilde{L}^\infty$ pseudometric through the same subsequence. But by Lemma 71, $m' \in K$. This completes the argument. □

Given a function $f : V_n \to \mathbb{C}$, let f_τ denote a random translate of f, that is,

$$f_\tau(x) := f(x + \tau),$$

where τ is uniformly distributed on V_n and the addition on the right-hand side is addition modulo n in each coordinate.

Lemma 73. *If f is a δ-soliton, then, provided that $n > C(\delta)$,*

$$\mathbb{P}(f_\tau \text{ is an improved } 2\delta\text{-soliton}) \ge 1 - Cn^{-1}.$$

Proof. Let $g : V_n \to \mathbb{C}$ be a function satisfying the requirements (a) and (b) in the definition of δ-soliton. Then clearly f_τ is also a δ-soliton, with g_τ serving the role of g. Let ∂V_n denote the boundary of V_n in $\mathbb{Z}^d$. Since τ is uniformly distributed on V_n, it is easy to see that

$$\mathbb{E}(M_{h,n}(g_\tau, \partial V_n)) = \frac{|\partial V_n|}{|V_n|} M_{h,n}(g) \le Cn^{-1}.$$

Therefore by Markov's inequality,

$$\mathbb{P}(M_{h,n}(g_\tau, \partial V_n) > n^{-1/2}) \le Cn^{-1/2}. \tag{124}$$

Now, $M_h(g_\tau^e) = M_{h,n}(g_\tau)$ and $N_h(g_\tau^e) = N_{h,n}(g_\tau)$. Also, it is easy to verify that

$$|G_h(g_\tau^e) - G_{h,n}(g_\tau)| \le CM_{h,n}(g_\tau, \partial V_n).$$

Thus, if $M_{h,n}(g_\tau, \partial V_n) \le n^{-1/2}$, then f_τ is an improved δ'-soliton, where $\delta' = \delta + Cn^{-1/2}$. By (124), this completes the proof. □

Proof of Theorem 5. First, assume that

$$E_{\min}(m_0, h) < E_0 < \frac{1}{2} E_{\max}(m_0, h). \tag{125}$$

By Lemma 12, $E_{\max}(m_0, h) = 2dm_0/h^2$. Therefore, we are in the setting of Theorem 30. Let

$$\begin{aligned} S &:= S_{\epsilon,h,n}(E_0, m_0) \\ &= \{v \in \mathbb{C}^{V_n} : |M_{h,n}(v) - m_0| \le \epsilon,\ |H_{h,n}(v) - E_0| \le \epsilon\}, \end{aligned}$$

as defined in Section 2. Let $f = f_{\epsilon,h,n}$ be a random function chosen uniformly from S. Let

$$A := \{v \in S : v \text{ is not a } \delta\text{-soliton}\}.$$

Then by Theorem 17 and Theorem 30,

$$\limsup_{\epsilon\to 0} \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{\log \mathbb{P}(\phi \in A) - \log \mathbb{P}(\phi \in S)}{n^d} < 0.$$

By Lemma 6, this shows that

$$\limsup_{\epsilon\to 0} \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{\log \mathbb{P}(f \in A)}{n^d} < 0.$$

In particular,

$$\lim_{\epsilon\to 0} \lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{P}(f \text{ is a } \delta\text{-soliton}) = 1. \tag{126}$$

But by Lemma 73,

$$\mathbb{P}(f_\tau \text{ is an improved } 2\delta\text{-soliton}) \ge (1 - Cn^{-1})\, \mathbb{P}(f \text{ is a } \delta\text{-soliton}).$$

However, f_τ has the same distribution as f. Combined with (126), this shows that

$$\lim_{\epsilon\to 0} \lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{P}(f \text{ is an improved } 2\delta\text{-soliton}) = 1.$$

Since this is true for any $\delta > 0$, Lemma 72 completes the proof of Theorem 5 for the $\tilde{L}^\infty$ pseudometric, under the condition (125).

To prove the result for general $q \in (2, \infty)$, simply observe that for any such q and any $v : \mathbb{Z}^d \to \mathbb{C}$,

$$\|v\|_q^q \le \|v\|_\infty^{q-2} \|v\|_2^2, \tag{127}$$

and that $\|f\|_2 \le C$ by definition.

When $E_0 \ge \frac{1}{2} E_{\max}(m_0, h)$, Theorem 5 is a direct consequence of Theorem 33 and Lemma 6. □

22. Proof of Theorem 1

As in Section 21, we will write E_0 instead of E and m_0 instead of m. The convention about the notation C will also be the same.

Let $K(h)$ be defined as in (123). Fix $q \in (2, \infty]$ and $\delta > 0$.

Lemma 74. *Whenever $h < C(q, \delta)$, for all $v \in \cup_{m' \in K(h)} \mathcal{S}(m', h)$*

$$\tilde{L}^q(\tilde{v}, Q_{\lambda(m_0)}) \le \delta/2,$$

where $\tilde{v}$ is the continuum image of $\tilde{v}$ at grid size h.

Proof. Take a sequence h_k decreasing to 0. For each k, let v_k be an element of $\cup_{m'\in K(h_k)}\mathcal{S}(m', h_k)$. Let $m'_k := M_{h_k}(v_k)$ and $m_k := m_0 - m'_k$. By definition of v_k, $m'_k \in K(h_k)$, and by definition of $K(h_k)$, there exists E_k such that $(E_k, m_k) \in \mathcal{M}(E_0, m_0, h)$. Therefore by Theorem 70, $\lim_{k\to\infty} m_k = 0$. Consequently, $M_{h_k}(v_k) \to m_0$. Since we know that v_k is a discrete ground state soliton for every k, therefore by Theorem 4,

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \tilde{L}^q(\tilde{v}_k, Q_{\lambda(m_0)}) = 0.$$

A simple argument by contradiction now completes the proof. □

Proof of Theorem 1. Fix $q \in (2,\infty]$ and $\delta > 0$. Take any h and any $v \in \cup_{m'\in K(h)}\mathcal{S}(m, h)$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{L}^q(\tilde{f}_{\epsilon,h,n},\ Q_{\lambda(m_0)}) &\le \tilde{L}^q(\tilde{f}_{\epsilon,h,n},\ \tilde{v}) + \tilde{L}^q(\tilde{v},\ Q_{\lambda(m_0)})\\ &= \tilde{L}^q(f_{\epsilon,h,n},\ v) + \tilde{L}^q(\tilde{v},\ Q_{\lambda(m_0)}).\end{aligned}$$

Thus, if $\tilde{L}^q(\tilde{v},\ Q_{\lambda(m_0)}) \le \delta/2$ for all $v \in \cup_{m'\in K(h)}\mathcal{S}(m', h)$, then

$$\mathbb{P}\big(\tilde{L}^q(\tilde{f}_{\epsilon,h,n},\ Q_{\lambda(m_0)}) > \delta\big) \le \mathbb{P}\big(\inf_{m'\in K(h)}\ \inf_{v\in\mathcal{S}(m',h)} \tilde{L}^q(f_{\epsilon,h,n},\ v) > \delta/2\big).$$

Now, $E_{\min}(m_0) < E_0 < \infty$ by assumption. Therefore, Corollary 69 and Lemma 12 show that for all sufficiently small h,

$$E_{\min}(m_0, h) < E_0 < \frac{dm_0}{h^2} = \frac{1}{2}E_{\max}(m_0, h).$$

Therefore by Theorem 5 and Lemma 74, for all $h < C(q, \delta)$,

$$\limsup_{\epsilon\to0}\limsup_{n\to\infty}\mathbb{P}\big(\tilde{L}^q(\tilde{f}_{\epsilon,h,n},\ Q_{\lambda(m_0)}) > \delta\big) = 0. \tag{128}$$

This completes the proof of the first part of Theorem 1. For the second part, first fix $q \in (2,\infty]$ and $\delta > 0$. Fix some $k > 0$. Choose h_k so small that $h_k < 1/k$ and (128) holds with $h = h_k$. Given h_k, choose ϵ_k so small that $\epsilon_k < 1/k$ and

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty}\mathbb{P}\big(\tilde{L}^q(\tilde{f}_{\epsilon_k,h_k,n},\ Q_{\lambda(m_0)}) > \delta\big) < 1/k.$$

Finally, given h_k and ϵ_k, choose n_k so large that $n_k h_k > k$ and

$$\mathbb{P}\big(\tilde{L}^q(\tilde{f}_{\epsilon_k,h_k,n_k},\ Q_{\lambda(m_0)}) > \delta\big) < 2/k.$$

This shows that

$$\lim_{k\to\infty}\mathbb{P}\big(\tilde{L}^q(\tilde{f}_{\epsilon_k,h_k,n_k},\ Q_{\lambda(m_0)}) > \delta\big) = 0.$$

Since such a sequence (ϵ_k, h_k, n_k) exists for any $\delta > 0$ (with q fixed), one can extract a sequence that works simultaneously for all $\delta > 0$ by a diagonal argument. In particular, there exists a sequence (ϵ_k, h_k, n_k) such that for all $\delta > 0$,

$$\lim_{k\to\infty}\mathbb{P}\big(\tilde{L}^\infty(\tilde{f}_{\epsilon_k,h_k,n_k},\ Q_{\lambda(m_0)}) > \delta\big) = 0.$$

But again, for any $v : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{C}$ and any $q \in (2,\infty]$, we have the inequality (127). Since the L^2 norm of $\tilde{f}_{\epsilon,h,n}$ is uniformly bounded (because $\|\tilde{f}_{\epsilon,h,n}\|_2^2 = M_{h,n}(f_{\epsilon,h,n}) \in [m_0 - \epsilon, m_0 + \epsilon]$), this completes the proof of the second assertion of Theorem 1. □

Acknowledgments. The author thanks Pierre Germain, Partha Dey, Terence Tao, Jalal Shatah, Phil Sosoe, Kay Kirkpatrick, Julien Barré, Lai-Sang Young, Carlos Kenig, Persi Diaconis and Raghu Varadhan for useful discussions. The manuscript of Raphaël [47] (which was brought to my attention by Pierre Germain) and Tao's book [62] have been of immeasurable help.

References

[1] Arnol'd, V. I. (1989). *Mathematical methods of classical mechanics.* Third edition. "Nauka", Moscow.

[2] Berestycki, H., Gallouët, T. and Kavian, O. (1983). Équations de champs scalaires euclidiens non lin'eaires dans le plan. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math.* **297** no. 5, 307–310.

[3] Berestycki, H. and Lions, P. L. (1979). Existence d'ondes solitaires dans des problèmes nonlinéaires du type Klein-Gordon. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. A-B* **288** no. 7, A395–A398.

[4] Bludov, Yu. V., Konotop, V. V. and Akhmediev, N. (2009). Matter rogue waves. *Phys. Rev. A* **80**, 033610.

[5] Bourgain, J. (1994). Periodic Nonlinear Schrödinger Equation and Invariant Measures, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **166**, 1–26.

[6] Bourgain, J. (1996). Invariant measures for the 2D-defocusing nonlinear Schrödinger equation. *Commun. Math. Phys.* **176**, 421–445.

[7] Bourgain, J. (1998). On nonlinear Schrödinger equations. *Les relations entre les mathématiques et la physique théorique: Festschrift for the 40th anniversary of the IHÉS.* Institut des hautes études scientifiques, 11–21.

[8] Bourgain, J. (2000). Invariant measures for NLS in Infinite Volume. *Commun. Math. Phys.* **210**, 605–620.

[9] Brydges, D. and Slade, G. (1996). Statistical Mechanics of the 2-Dimensional Focusing Nonlinear Schrödinger Equation, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **182**, 485–504.

[10] Burq, N. and Tzvetkov, N. (2007). Invariant measure for a three dimensional nonlinear wave equation. *Int. Math. Res. Not.* IMRN 2007, no. 22, Art. ID rnm108, 26 pp.

[11] Burq, N. and Tzvetkov, N. (2008). Random data Cauchy theory for supercritical wave equations. I. Local theory. *Invent. Math.* **173** no. 3, 449–475.

[12] Burq, N. and Tzvetkov, N. (2008). Random data Cauchy theory for supercritical wave equations. II. A global existence result. *Invent. Math.* **173** no. 3, 477–496.

[13] Cazenave, T. (1989). *An introduction to nonlinear Schrödinger equations.* Textos de Metodes Matematicos **22** (Rio de Janeiro).

[14] Chatterjee, S. (2010). A note about the uniform distribution on the intersection of a simplex and a sphere. *Preprint.* Available at http://arxiv.org/abs/1011.4043

[15] Chatterjee, S. and Kirkpatrick, K. (2010). Probabilistic methods for discrete nonlinear Schrödinger equations. To appear in *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* Available at http://arxiv.org/pdf/1009.5737

[16] Coffman, C. V. (1972). Uniqueness of the ground state solution for $\Delta u - u + u^3 = 0$ and a variational characterization of other solutions. *Arch. Rat. Mech. Anal.* **46**, 81–95.

[17] Colliander J. and Oh, T. (2009). Almost sure well-posedenss of the cubic nonlinear Schrödinger equation below $L^2(\mathbb{T})$. *Preprint.* Available at http://arxiv.org/pdf/0904.2820

[18] Duyckaerts, T., Kenig, C. and Merle, F. (2012). Classification of radial solutions of the focusing, energy-critical wave equation. *Preprint.* Available at http://arxiv.org/abs/1204.0031

[19] Eckhaus, W. (1985). The long-time behaviour for perturbed wave-equations and related problems. In *Trends in applications of pure mathematics to mechanics (Bad Honnef, 1985), vol. 249 of Lecture Notes in Phys.* Springer, Berlin, 1986, pp. 168–194.

[20] Eckhaus, W. and Schuur, P. C. (1983). The emergence of solitons of the Korteweg-de Vries equation from arbitrary initial conditions. *Math. Methods Appl. Sci.* **5** no. 1, 97–116.

[21] Erdős, L., Schlein, B. and Yau, H.-T. (2007). Derivation of the cubic non-linear Schrödinger equation from quantum dynamics of many-body systems. *Invent. Math.* **167**, 515–614.

[22] Erdős, L., Schlein, B. and Yau, H.-T. (2010). Derivation of the Gross-Pitaevskii Equation for the Dynamics of Bose-Einstein Condensate. *Ann. of Math. (2),* **172** no. 1, 291–370.

[23] Flach, S., Kladko, K. and MacKay, R. S. (1997). Energy thresholds for discrete breathers in one-, two- and three-dimensional lattices. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **78**, 1207–1210.

[24] Glimm, J. and Jaffe, A. (1987). *Quantum physics. A functional integral point of view.* Second edition. Springer-Verlag, New York.

[25] Hoeffding, W. (1963). Probability inequalities for sums of bounded random variables. *J. Amer. Stat. Assoc.,* **58**, 13–30.

[26] Kenig, C. E. and Merle, F. (2006). Global well-posedness, scattering and blow-up for the energy-critical, focusing, non-linear Schrödinger equation in the radial case. *Invent. Math.* **166** no. 3, 645–675.

[27] Kevrekidis, P. G. (2009). *The discrete nonlinear Schrödinger equation. Mathematical analysis, numerical computations and physical perspectives.* Edited by P. G. Kevrekidis. Springer-Verlag, Berlin.

[28] Killip, R. and Visan, M. (2010). The focusing energy-critical nonlinear Schrödinger equation in dimensions five and higher. *Amer. J. Math.* **132** no. 2, 361–424.

[29] Kirkpatrick, K., Lenzmann, E. and Staffilani, G. (2011). On the continuum limit for discrete NLS with long-range lattice interactions. *Preprint.* Available at http://arxiv.org/pdf/1108.6136

[30] Kirkpatrick, K., Schlein, B. and Staffilani, G. (2011). Derivation of the two dimensional nonlinear Schrödinger equation from many body quantum dynamics. *Amer. J. Math.* **133** no. 1, 91–130.

[31] Ladyzhenskaya, O. A. (1985). *The boundary value problems of mathematical physics.* Springer-Verlag, New York.

[32] Lebowitz, J. L., Mounaix, Ph. and Wang, W.-M. (2011). Approach to equilibrium for the stochastic NLS. *Preprint.* Available at http://arxiv.org/abs/1202.1642

[33] Lebowitz, J., Rose, H. and Speer, E. (1988). Statistical Mechanics of the Nonlinear Schrödinger equation. *J. Stat. Phys.* **50** no. 3-4, 657–687.

[34] Miura, R. M. The Korteweg-de Vries equation: a survey of results. *SIAM Rev.* **18** no. 3, 412–459.

[35] McKean, H. P. (1995). Statistical mechanics of nonlinear wave equations. IV. Cubic Schrödinger. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **168** no. 3, 479–491.

[36] McKean H. P. and Vaninsky, K. L. (1994). Brownian motion with restoring drift: the petit and micro-canonical ensembles. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **160** no. 3, 615–630.

[37] McKean H. P. and Vaninsky, K. L. (1997). Action-angle variables for the cubic Schrödinger equation. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **50**, no. 6, 489–562.

[38] McKean H. P. and Vaninsky, K. L. (1997). Cubic Schrödinger: the petit canonical ensemble in action-angle variables. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **50**, no. 7, 593–622.

[39] Nahmod, A. R., Rey-Bellet, L., Sheffield, S. and Staffilani, G. (2011). Absolute continuity of Brownian bridges under certain gauge transformations. *Preprint.* Available at http://arxiv.org/pdf/1103.4822

[40] Nakanishi, K. and Schlag, W. (2011). Invariant manifolds and dispersive Hamiltonian evolution equations. Zürich Lectures in Advanced Mathematics. *European Mathematical Society (EMS), Zürich.*

[41] Novokšenov, V. Ju. (1980). Asymptotic behavior as $t \to \infty$ of the solution of the Cauchy problem for a nonlinear Schrdinger equation. (Russian) *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR* **251** no. 4, 799–802.

[42] Oh, T. (2009). Invariant Gibbs measures and a.s. global well posedness for coupled KdV systems. *Differential Integral Equations* **22** no. 7-8, 637–668.

[43] Oh, T. (2009). Invariance of the white noise for KdV. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **292** no. 1, 217–236.

[44] Oh, T. (2010). Invariance of the Gibbs measure for the Schrödinger-Benjamin-Ono system. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.* **41** no. 6, 2207–2225.

[45] Oh, T. and Quastel, J. (2010). On invariant Gibbs measures conditioned on mass and momentum. *Preprint.* Available at http://arxiv.org/pdf/1012.3432

[46] Oh, T., Quastel, J. and Valko, B. (2010). Interpolation of Gibbs measures with White Noise for Hamiltonian PDE. *Preprint.* Available at http://arxiv.org/pdf/1005.3957

[47] Raphaël, P. (2008). Stability and blow up for the non linear Schrödinger equation. *Lecture notes from the Clay Math 2008 Summer School on Evolution Equations.* Available at http://www.claymath.org/programs/summer_school/2008/raphael.pdf and also at http://www.math.univ-toulouse.fr/∼raphael/Publications/cours-zurich.pdf

[48] Rider, B. (2002). On the ∞-volume limit of focussing cubic Schrödinger equation, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **55**, 1231–1248.

[49] Rider, B. (2003). Fluctuations in the thermodynamic limit of focussing cubic Schrödinger. *J. Stat. Phys.* **113**, 575–594.

[50] Robbins, Herbert (1955). A remark on Stirling's formula. *Amer. Math. Monthly* **62** 26–29.

[51] Rumpf, B. and Newell, A. C. (2001). Coherent Structures and Entropy in Constrained, Modulationally Unstable, Nonintegrable Systems. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **87**, no. 5, 054102.

[52] Rumpf, B. (2004). Simple statistical explanation for the localization of energy in nonlinear lattices with two conserved quantities. *Phys. Rev. E* **69**, 016618.

[53] Schuur, P. C. (1986). *Asymptotic analysis of soliton problems.* Springer- Verlag, Berlin.

[54] Segur, H. (1973). The Korteweg-de Vries equation and water waves. Solutions of the equation. *I. J. Fluid Mech.* **59**, 721–736.

[55] Segur, H. and Ablowitz, M. J. (1976). Asymptotic solutions and conservation laws for the nonlinear Schrödinger equation. *J. Mathematical Phys.* **17** no. 5, 710–716.

[56] Soffer, A. (2006). Soliton dynamics and scattering. *International Congress of Mathematicians.* Vol. III, 459–471, Eur. Math. Soc., Zrich.

[57] Stein, E. M. (1970). *Singular integrals and differentiability properties of functions.* Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ.

[58] Stein, E. M. (1993). *Harmonic analysis: real-variable methods, orthogonality, and oscillatory integrals.* Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1993.

[59] Stein, E. M. and Weiss, G. (1971). *Introduction to Fourier analysis on Euclidean spaces.* Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ.

[60] Strauss, W. (1989). *Nonlinear wave equations.* Regional Conf. Series in Math.

[61] Tao, T. (2004). On the asymptotic behavior of large radial data for a focusing non-linear Schrödinger equation. *Dyn. Partial Differ. Equ.* **1** no. 1, 1–48.

[62] Tao, T. (2006). *Nonlinear dispersive equations. Local and global analysis.* American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI.

[63] Tao, T. (2007). A (concentration-)compact attractor for high-dimensional non-linear Schrödinger equations. *Dyn. Partial Differ. Equ.* **4** no. 1, 1–53.

[64] Tao, T. (2009). Why are solitons stable? *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (N.S.)* **46** no. 1, 1–33.

[65] Thomann, L. and Tzvetkov, N. (2010). Gibbs measure for the periodic derivative nonlinear Schrödinger equation. *Nonlinearity* **23** no. 11, 2771–2791.

[66] Tzvetkov, N. (2006). Invariant measures for the nonlinear Schrödinger equation on the disc. *Dyn. Partial Differ. Equ.* **3** no. 2, 111–160.

[67] Tzvetkov, N. (2008). Invariant measures for the defocusing nonlinear Schrödinger equation. *Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble)* **58** no. 7, 2543–2604.

[68] Tzvetkov, N. (2010). Construction of a Gibbs measure associated to the periodic Benjamin-Ono equation. *Probab. Theory Related Fields* **146** no. 3-4, 481–514.

[69] Walters, P. (1982). *An introduction to ergodic theory.* Springer-Verlag, New York-Berlin.

[70] Weinstein, M. I. (1999). Excitation Thresholds for Nonlinear Localized Modes on Lattices. *Nonlinearity,* **12** no. 3, 673–691.

[71] Zakharov, V. E. (1968). Stability of periodic waves of finite amplitude on a surface of deep fluid, *J. Appl. Mech. Tech. Phys.* **2**, 190–198.

[72] Zakharov, V. E. and Shabat, A. B. (1972). Exact theory of two-dimensional self-focusing and one-dimensional self-modulation of waves in nonlinear media. *Soviet Physics JETP* **34** no. 1, 62–69.

[73] Zhidkov, P. E. (1991). An invariant measure for the nonlinear Schrödinger equation. (Russian) *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR* **317** no. 3, 543–546; translation in *Soviet Math. Dokl.* **43** no. 2, 431–434.

Courant Institute of Mathematical Sciences, New York University, 251 Mercer Street, New York, NY 10012
E-mail address: `sourav@cims.nyu.edu`